

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096617 1









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



# The Irish Ecclesiastical Record

A Monthly Journal under Episcopal Sanction

VOLUME XVI

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1920

*FIFTH SERIES*

DUBLIN

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU STREET

1920

*ALL RIGHTS RESERVED*

JUL 27 1957

**Nihil Obstat :**

**TERENTIUS O'DONNELL, S.T.D.,**

*Censor Dep.*

**Imprimi potest :**

**✠ GULIELMUS,**

*Archiep. Dublinen.,*

*Hiberniae Primas.*



# CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVI

## ARTICLES

|  | PAGE                  |
|--|-----------------------|
| Abbey of SS. Peter and Paul, Newtown, Trim . . . . .   | 483                   |
| By Very Rev. Philip Callary, P.P., V.G.  |                       |
| Blessed Oliver Plunkett . . . . .  | 265                   |
| By Rev. Myles V. Ronan   |                       |
| Canons Regular in Ireland, The : St. Mary's Church, New Ross . . . . .                                       | 29                    |
| By J. B. Cullen  |                       |
| Catholic Church and Art, The : The Sacred Art of Spain . . . . .   | 365                   |
| By Rev. E. A. Foran, O.S.A.  |                       |
| Cult of Beatified Servants of God, The . . . . .   | 89                    |
| By Rev. J. B. O'Connell, B.A., B.D.  |                       |
| Death, Two Aspects of . . . . .  | 1                     |
| By Right Rev. John S. Vaughan, D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis  |                       |
| Debt the World Owes to the Church, The . . . . .   | 470                   |
| By Rev. Stephen J. Roche . . . . .   |                       |
| Dr. Murray of Maynooth . . . . .   | 21, 94, 194, 289, 377 |
| By Rev. E. J. Quigley  |                       |
| Friar at Court, A : Thomas Rushook, O.P., Bishop of Llandaff,<br>Chichester, and Kilmore (1383-93) . . . . . | 241                   |
| By Rev. Walter Gumbley, O.P.   |                       |
| Griessstetten, The Three Scoto-Irish Hermits of . . . . .  | 441                   |
| By Dom Patrick Nolan, O.S.B., M.A.   |                       |
| Holy Eucharist in St. Ireneus, The . . . . .   | 389                   |
| By Rev. Edward R. James  |                       |
| Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, Sermons and Instructions on the . . . . .  | 118                   |
| By Rev. Joseph M'Cormack   |                       |
| Internal Sins, The Confession of . . . . .   | 100                   |
| By Rev. David Barry  |                       |
| Mental Prayer in the Order of St. Dominic, On the History of . . . . .                                       | 177                   |
| By Rev. R. P. Devas, O.P.  |                       |
| Mental Restriction and Equivocation . . . . .  | 461                   |
| By Rev. J. Brodie Brosnan, M.A.  |                       |
| 'Octavius' of Minucius Felix, The Date of the . . . . .  | 353                   |
| By Rev. R. Hull, S.J.  |                       |
| Perfect Contrition . . . . .   | 203                   |
| By 'A Missionary Priest'   |                       |
| Portugal, Recent Impressions of . . . . .  | 276                   |
| By Rev. M. H. MacInerny, O.P.  |                       |
| Profit-Sharing : As it Affects the Relations of Labour and Capital . . . . .                                 | 8                     |
| By Rev. P. J. Vesey, S.T.L.  |                       |



|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Reformation of the Thirteenth Century, The . . . . .                              | 135 |
| By Rev. Stephen J. Roche  |     |
| St. Cyprian and 'Cathedra Petri,' Mr. T. A. Lacey and . . . . .                   | 300 |
| By Rev. B. V. Miller  |     |
| Two Great Preachers of Truth in the Last Century : Lacordaire and Burke . . . . . | 108 |
| By Rev. Alban King, O.P., S.T.L.  |     |
| 'Woman of the Piercing Wail, The': The Lady Nuala O'Donnell . . . . .             | 216 |
| By H. Concannon   |     |
| X-Rays : Their Silver Jubilee . . . . .   | 453 |
| By Rev. H. V. Gill, S.J., M.A., M.Sc.   |     |

## CONTRIBUTORS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| BARRY, REV. DAVID—The Confession of Internal Sins . . . . .   | 100 |
| BROSNAN, REV. J. BRODIE, M.A.—Mental Restriction and Equivocation . . . . .   | 461 |
| CALLARY, VERY REV. PHILIP, P.P., V.G.—The Abbey of SS. Peter and Paul, Newtown, Trim . . . . .                                    | 483 |
| CONCANNON, H.—'The Woman of the Piercing Wail': The Lady Nuala O'Donnell . . . . .  | 216 |
| CULLEN, J. B.—The Canons Regular in Ireland : St. Mary's Church, New Ross . . . . .   | 29  |
| DEVAS, REV. R. P., O.P.—On the History of Mental Prayer in the Order of St. Dominic . . . . .                                     | 177 |
| EATON, REV. M., B.A., B.D.—Liturgy . . . . . 63, 328, 419,  | 512 |
| FORAN, REV. E. A., O.S.A.—The Catholic Church and Art : The Sacred Art of Spain . . . . .   | 365 |
| GILL, REV. H. V., S.J., M.A., M.Sc.—X-Rays : Their Silver Jubilee . . . . .   | 453 |
| GUMBLEY, REV. WALTER, O.P.—A Friar at Court—Thomas Rushook, O.P., Bishop of Llandaff, Chichester, and Kilmore (1383-93) . . . . . | 241 |
| HULL, REV. R., S.J.—The Date of the 'Octavius' of Minucius Felix . . . . .  | 353 |
| JAMES, REV. EDWARD R.—The Holy Eucharist in St. Ireneus . . . . .   | 389 |
| KINANE, REV. J., D.C.L.—Canon Law . . . . . 57, 322, 412,   | 505 |
| KING, REV. ALBAN, O.P., S.T.L.—Two Great Preachers of Truth in the Last Century : Lacordaire and Burke . . . . .                  | 108 |
| M'CORMACK, REV. JOSEPH—Sermons and Instructions on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass . . . . .                                       | 118 |
| MACINERNY, REV. M. H., O.P.—Recent Impressions of Portugal . . . . .  | 276 |
| MILLER, REV. B. V.—Mr. T. A. Lacey, St. Cyprian, and 'Cathedra Petri' . . . . .   | 300 |
| 'MISSIONARY PRIEST, A'—Perfect Contrition . . . . .   | 203 |
| NOLAN, DOM PATRICK, O.S.B., M.A.—The Three Scoto-Irish Hermits of Griesstetten . . . . .  | 441 |
| O'CONNELL, REV. J. B., B.A., B.D.—The Cult of Beatified Servants of God . . . . .   | 89  |
| O'DONNELL, REV. M. J., D.D.—Theology . . . . . 47, 314, 404,  | 497 |
| QUIGLEY, REV. E. J.—Dr. Murray of Maynooth . . . . . 21, 94, 194, 289,  | 377 |



|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| ROCHE, REV. STEPHEN J.—The Debt the World Owes to the Church . . . . .                                    | 470  |
| — The Reformation of the Thirteenth Century . . . . .   | 135  |
| RONAN, REV. MYLES V.—Blessed Oliver Plunkett . . . . .  | 265  |
| VAUGHAN, RIGHT REV. JOHN S., D.D.—Two Aspects of Death . . . . .  | 1    |
| VESEY, REV. P. J., S.T.L.—Profit-Sharing : As it Affects the Relations<br>of Labour and Capital . . . . . | 8    |

## NOTES AND QUERIES

### Theology :

By Rev. Professor M. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Absolution given in Ignorance . . . . .   | 314     |
| — of ' Peregrini ' . . . . .  | 54      |
| Banns . . . . .   | 49, 409 |
| Bequests for Charitable Purposes—The O'Hagan Clause . . . . .   | 318     |
| Censures already incurred, Effect of Code on . . . . .  | 52      |
| Confessor's Power of Dispensation, A—Special Reply of the Con-<br>gregation of the Sacraments . . . . . | 404     |
| Death, Place of . . . . .   | 317     |
| Delegation of Curates . . . . .   | 49      |
| Easter, Date of . . . . .   | 47      |
| Jurisdiction, When does the Church supply ? . . . .   | 499     |
| Law of Fast, The—Irish Indult . . . . .   | 497     |
| Multiple Impediment and Dispensation . . . . .  | 314     |
| Sunday Observance . . . . .   | 503     |

### Canon Law :

By Rev. Professor J. KINANE, D.C.L.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Bination and Preaching . . . . .  | 57  |
| Bishops, Certain Powers of, in regard to the Dispensation from the<br>Laws of Provincial and National Councils, the fixing of the Tax<br>for Manual Masses, and the Absolution from the Excommunica-<br>tion attached to the crimes of Apostasy, Heresy, and Schism . . . . . | 505 |
| Competency by reason of Contract in Matrimonial Cases . . . . .   | 61  |
| Honorarium for a ' Second Mass ' . . . . .  | 58  |
| ' Latae sententiae ' Punishments, The Necessity for a declaratory<br>Sentence in . . . . .  | 322 |
| ' Lingua patria,' The Meaning of, in Canon 1364, n. 2 . . . . .   | 509 |
| Parish Priest, Certain Obligations of a . . . . .   | 412 |
| Place in which Temporary Profession should be made, The . . . . .   | 507 |
| Priests' Letters to Newspapers . . . . .  | 416 |
| Reading of Newspapers by Clerical Students, The . . . . .   | 417 |
| Rescripts, The effect of the clause ' Motu proprio ' on . . . . .   | 510 |
| Superfluous Revenues of Benefices, The Obligation to Expend the,<br>on Charity and Pious Purposes . . . . .   | 322 |
| Vicars-General, Some Points in connexion with . . . . .   | 327 |



NOTES AND QUERIES—*continued*.

## Liturgy :

By Rev. Professor M. EATON, B.A., B.D.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 'Alleluia' and Paschal Time, The . . . . .   | 328 |
| Baptism and Marriage, Registration of . . . . .  | 328 |
| Cere-cloth on an Altar-stone, The . . . . .  | 328 |
| Chanting of the 'propria' in a sung Mass . . . . .   | 516 |
| Children of Mary, The Confraternity of the . . . . .   | 331 |
| Consecration of Families and Schools to the Sacred Heart and the<br>Apostleship of Prayer . . . . .                  | 331 |
| Faculties for Blessing Beads, etc., The Consent of the Ordinary<br>in connexion with . . . . .                       | 420 |
| Feast of the Immaculate Conception . . . . .   | 66  |
| Is a Convent Oratory Semi-public? . . . . .  | 516 |
| Mass on an Altar without Relics . . . . .  | 421 |
| Midnight Mass on Christmas Eve, and Holy Communion . . . . .   | 512 |
| Nuptial Mass and Blessing, Some Questions regarding the . . . . .  | 63  |
| October Devotions, Queries regarding the . . . . .   | 422 |
| Prayers after Mass . . . . .   | 516 |
| Prayers for the Pope's Intention . . . . .   | 422 |
| Requiem Mass 'post acceptum mortis nuntium'—The Privileged<br>Mass of Third and Seventh Days 'post obitum' . . . . . | 514 |
| Stations of the Cross, Faculties for Erecting . . . . .  | 419 |

## DOCUMENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Address of the Holy Father at the Semi-public Consistory on the<br>Canonization of Gabriel of the Dolorous Virgin, of Margaret<br>Mary Alacoque, and of Joan of Arc . . . . .        | 156 |
| Aeronauts, Our Lady of Loreto is declared the Patroness of . . . . .   | 170 |
| Aeroplane, A New Formula of Blessing an, approved by the Sacred<br>Congregation of Rites . . . . .   | 171 |
| Cardiff, Apostolic Constitution erecting a New Abbey at . . . . .  | 254 |
| Ceremonial Dress and Privileges of Bishops, Doubts regarding the,<br>solved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites . . . . .  | 339 |
| Charles Levanga, Matthias Morumba, and their Companions, Martyrs of<br>Uganda, Apostolic Letter decreeing the Beatification of the<br>Venerable Servants of God . . . . .            | 162 |
| Encyclical Letter of Benedict XV on Peace and Christian Reconciliation . . . . .   | 69  |
| English Translation of same . . . . .  | 75  |
| Erection of Quasi-parishes in Vicariates and Prefectures Apostolic,<br>Instruction of the Sacred Congregation De Propaganda Fide<br>regarding the . . . . .                          | 253 |
| Feast of the Immaculate Conception, Letter from the Holy See to His<br>Eminence Cardinal Logue granting that the, be henceforth a<br>Holiday of Obligation for all Ireland . . . . . | 68  |
| 'Guido da Verona,' The Works of the Author known as, are put on the<br>Index of Prohibited Books . . . . .   | 173 |



|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Head of Blessed Oliver Plunket, Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites regarding the Custody of the . . . . .   | 337  |
| Italy, Circular Letter of the Sacred Congregation of the Council to the Ordinaries of . . . . .   | 258  |
| Letter of Benedict XV to His Eminence Cardinal La Fontaine and the other Bishops of the Province of Venice . . . . .  | 256  |
| Marcellinus Champagnat, Marist Priest, and Founder of the Congregation of the Little Brothers of Mary, Decree regarding the Beatification and Canonization of the Servant of God . . . . .                                      | 340  |
| Maria Clotildes Angela and her Ten Companions of the Ursuline Nuns of Valencia, Decree Declaring the Beatification of . . . . .   | 343  |
| Maria Magdalen Fontaine and her Three Associates of the Institute of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Decree declaring the Beatification of . . . . .   | 343  |
| 'Memoriale Rituum,' Approval of a new Typical Edition of the . . . . .  | 521  |
| Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, Decree of the Holy Office regarding the . . . . .  | 172  |
| Motu Proprio on the Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Declaration of St. Joseph as Patron of the Catholic Church . . . . .   | 250  |
| Oriental Pontifical Institute, The Faculty of Conferring the Doctorate is granted to the . . . . .  | 431  |
| Passionist Order, Bi-Centenary of the—Letter of His Holiness the Pope Prefecture Apostolic of French Guinea, in West Africa, is erected into a Vicariate Apostolic . . . . .  | 430  |
| — — — of Lower Nigeria, in West Africa, is erected into a Vicariate Apostolic with the title of Southern Nigeria . . . . .  | 432  |
| Re-election to the Offices of Mother-General in Religious Congregations and of the Mother Superioress in Convents, Circular Letter from the Sacred Congregation of Religious to Ordinaries of of Places regarding the . . . . . | 338  |
| Rochette, Bishops of Regular Orders are granted the privilege of wearing the . . . . .  | 172  |
| 'Roman Missal,' The Typical Edition of the New, is Approved . . . . .   | 520  |
| St. Jerome, Apostolic Letter decreeing a Solemn Triduum at the Liberian Basilica, and similar Supplications throughout the World, on the occasion of the Fifteenth Centenary of the Death of . . . . .                          | 518  |
| Scotch College at Rome, Apostolic Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh and the other Bishops of Scotland, concerning the . . . . .   | 429  |
| Solemn Canonization of Blessed Gabriel and Blessed Margaret Mary in the Vatican Basilica, and the Homily of the Holy Father on the Occasion . . . . .   | 159  |
| — — — of Blessed Joan of Arc in the Vatican Basilica, and the Homily of the Holy Father . . . . .   | 160  |
| Solemnity of the Holy Rosary, The Privilege attaching to the, does not extend to other Feasts . . . . .   | 83   |
| Statement issued by the Cardinal Primate and the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland on the present Condition of their Country . . . . .   | 424  |
| Venerable Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, The Solemn Beatification of . . . . .  | 152  |

## REVIEWS AND NOTES

'An Siolaoóip,' 85; 'Brevis Collectio excerpta e "Rituali Parvo" in usum Cleri extra loca sacra ministrantis,' 525; 'Catholic Doctrine of Grace, The,' 261; 'Catholic Student, The,' 174; 'Christian Faith, The,' 262; 'De Delictis et Poenis,' 84; 'Divine Office, The—A Study of the Roman Breviary,' 523; 'Good Shepherd Chronicles,' 349; 'Great French Sermons from Bousset, Bourdaloue, and Massillon,' 263; 'Hints on Reading and Public Speaking,' 433; 'History of the Diocese of Raphoe, A,' 522; 'La Messe Méditée au pied du S. Sacrament,' 88; 'Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne,' 434; 'Le Christ dans Ses Mystères,' 527; 'Le Christ, Vie de l'Ame,' 526; 'Letters and Papers hitherto unpublished of the Fathers Lacordaire, Jandel, Danzas,' 260; 'Mother of Christ, The, or the Blessed Virgin Mary in Catholic Tradition, Theology, and Devotion,' 86; 'On the Morals of To-day,' 350; 'Passion and Glory of Christ, The,' 439; 'St. Paul—His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine,' 436; 'Twenty Cures at Lourdes Medically Examined,' 175; Books, etc., Received, 176, 264, 352, 440, 528.



# THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

## TWO ASPECTS OF DEATH

By THE BISHOP OF SEBASTOPOLIS

DEATH is indeed a tremendous and a startling reality. It is one of the most formidable facts of life—a truth, which stares us in the face throughout the whole course of our chequered career. Yet, it wears two totally different aspects, according to the way in which we look at it. It may be considered from two totally different points of view: one of which is well calculated to repel us and to inspire dread and fear, while the other serves rather to attract us and to fill us with the brightest anticipations. That death should be feared, is natural and right, because it is intended by God to be *a punishment and a chastisement of sin*, and we should recognize and accept it as such, seeing in it a direct consequence of man's fatal transgression, and a just penalty of his mad rebellion.

Yet, in spite of all this, there is something extremely beautiful and desirable in death, inasmuch as it is, for the faithful and God-fearing soul, the gate that leads directly to Heaven and to God, the unfailing source and the exhaustless fount of perfect peace and unutterable joy. Hence, if worldlings and unbelievers dread its approach, the saints, who after all are our very best and most enlightened models, have looked forward to it, and awaited it, not only with perfect calmness and resignation, but even with a certain holy impatience. They have regarded it as the end, not so much perhaps of trial and danger and temptation, as of all sin and moral delinquency. In short, as a crisis which, once passed, would leave them for evermore free from all possibility of offending God again! And how much that means to a saint, words fail to express.

And, surely, this attitude of peaceful content and hope, if not even of impatient longing, is likewise most reasonable and correct. Indeed, if we consider that we have been actually called into being, not for time but for eternity; not for earth but for Heaven; not for the creature but for the Creator; it would seem that the summons from this sinful world to the world of perfect sanctity, should be hailed with the greatest delight and yearned after, with a strong interior joy. For—to one who is serving God loyally—what, after all, is death but the voice of God calling him to his reward; what is it but the flinging open of the prison gates and the loving invitation of the Heavenly Bridegroom, bidding the poor exile of earth to enter into Eternal Life. ‘Arise, make haste, My love, My dove, My beautiful one, arise, and come, for winter [*the winter of sin, and of all spiritual bleakness and barrenness*] is now past, the rain [*the rain of trial, tribulation and temptation*] is over and gone, and the flowers [*flowers of virtue and holiness*] have appeared in the land.’<sup>1</sup>

Oh, who would wish to tarry longer on this cold earth when once the voice of the Beloved is heard calling him away to the inexpressible delights of Heaven, and to the glorious Nuptials of the Lamb?

It is interesting to note here, that when our great martyr Blessed Thomas More was but thirty-eight years old (A.D. 1516) he wrote his famous *Utopia*. Now, in that well-known work he represents the citizens of his Model Republic as having nothing but the light of Nature to guide them. And it is well worth our while, in the present connexion, to note that, though divided in their opinions about religion, ‘there was,’ says More, ‘one matter in which all were agreed: viz., that *death is a boon and not a calamity*.’ In describing the public worship of this, of course, purely imaginary people he writes:—

They pray that God may give them an easy passage, at last, to Himself, not indeed presuming to set limits to Him, how early or late it should be; but, if it may be wished for, without derogating from His supreme authority, they desire to be *quickly* delivered, and to be taken to Himself, even though by the most terrible kind of death, *rather than to be detained long from seeing Him*, by the most prosperous course of life.

A little further on, this glorious martyr sets forth, some-

<sup>1</sup> Canticle of Canticles ii. 10.



what more fully, in the following striking words, their views of life, death, and eternity:—

Though they are compassionate to all who are sick, yet they lament no man's death, except they see him loath to part with life. They think that such a man's appearance before God cannot be acceptable to Him, who being called on, does not go out cheerfully, but is backward and unwilling, and is, as it were, dragged to it. In fact, they are struck with horror, when they see any die in this manner, and carry their dead bodies out in silence and with sorrow, praying God that He would be merciful to the errors of the departed soul, whose remains they lay in the ground: but [continues the saintly author], when any die cheerfully and full of hope, they do not mourn for them, but sing hymns when they carry out their bodies, commending their souls very earnestly to God.

In the above thoughtful and striking passage, Blessed Thomas More was, I strongly suspect, seeking to put some of us luke-warm Christians to shame. For it is a sad reflection upon so many who possess the faith, that men, who had only the light of Nature to guide them, should welcome and rejoice to appear before God, while Christians, to whom is promised the Beatific Vision, should shrink from it, defer it as long as possible, and speak in hollow tones and in bated breath, of the 'poor' souls! who have gone to enjoy it.

In these writings, Blessed Thomas More intended to invest the people of his imaginary Republic with sentiments and dispositions which he considered ought to characterize all really good and wise men, and which, there is no doubt, he entertained himself. For his biographer tells us

From his childhood More had kept himself in readiness for the call. He had awaited it in his merry boyhood, in his innocent yet active youth, and in his busy and prosperous manhood, and he ardently longed for the unveiled presence of God, as *the one and only thing to look forward to*.

Yet he was but a layman; a man of the world, with a wife and family and heavy worldly responsibilities. If then he could repeat, and with so much feeling and sincerity, the inspired words of Holy David, surely we should find it easy to do the same.

As the hart panteth after the fountains of water, so my soul panteth after Thee, O God. My soul hath thirsted after the strong living God; when shall I come and appear before the face of God?

But few, even of us Catholics, reflect sufficiently on the greatness of the rewards which God has prepared for those

who love Him. If we were all such as we ought to be, says Blessed Thomas More,

I would then put no doubt, but that unto any man the most comfortable talking that could be were to hear of Heaven. Whereas now, God help us ! our wretchedness is such, that in talking awhile thereof, men wax almost weary, as though to hear of Heaven were a heavy burden, so that they must refresh themselves after with a foolish tale. Our affection towards heavenly joys waxeth wonderful cold. If [he adds] with much truth dread of hell were as far gone, very few would fear God ; but fortunately, that still sticketh yet a little in our stomachs.

If, however, we rise from the low dreary swamps of ordinary life, and ascend the clear mountain tops, to which the saints have ascended, we shall find that there is no want of appreciation of God's sublime promises to be met with there. Take St. Teresa as a specimen of the rest, and mark her words of impatient yearning as she addresses God in prayer :—

When I consider, O my God [she cries], the glory Thou hast in store for those who accomplish Thy will to the end ; the labours and sufferings of Thy Son to obtain it for us ; when I think how unworthy we are of it, and how greatly the excess of the love of a God, who has taught us to love by dying for us, merits that it should not be repaid with ingratitude, my soul is seized with the most profound sorrow. How is it possible, Lord, that all this is effaced from the mind and that mortals forget Thee so far as to offend Thee.

In another place, she breaks out into these burning words :

Alas ! alas ! Lord, how this exile is prolonged ! And what torments I suffer from it, in not being able, O God of my heart ! to quench the thirst I have for Thee, my sweet Master. What can a soul do, who is captive in this prison ? O Jesus ! how long is the life of man, though they say it is short ! Doubtless it is short, to gain, by means of it, a life without end : but it is very long for a soul consumed with the desire of seeing her God. What solace doest Thou give for this martyrdom ? There is none, unless it be to endure it for love of Thee. How long doth my Lord delay to come ? Let Him come to me, His poor servant, and make me joyful. Let Him stretch forth His hand and deliver me, wretched as I am, from all anguish. Come, oh, come, for without Thee I can never have one joyful day nor hour : for Thou art my joy, and without Thee my table is empty. I am miserable, and, as it were, imprisoned, and weighed down with fetters, till with the light of Thy presence Thou comfortest me, givest me liberty and showest me Thy friendly countenance.

St. John of the Cross, speaking of a soul burning with love of God, says :—

As a lioness or a bear, robbed of its whelps, whom it cannot find, seeks them anxiously and earnestly, so does the soul, wounded with love,



seek after God. Being in darkness, it feels His absence, and is dying of love. This is that impatient love which no man can endure long without either obtaining his wishes or else dying. It is like that of Rachel, when she said, 'Give me children, otherwise I shall die.'<sup>1</sup>

Talking of the wound of love, the Author of *The Spiritual Life and Prayer* writes :—

This wound evidently carries fire and sword into the innermost depths of the soul. It causes a pain so intense, so unspeakable, that if the soul did not restrain herself she would utter loud cries. . . . *The desire of death* then becomes so violent, that no consideration whatever can moderate it; the soul is, as it were, deaf to the arguments which might help her to support life, for her will, violently drawn towards the sovereign beauty, seems no longer in a condition to resist this attraction. If all the blessings of earth and of Heaven were offered to her, she would remain insensible to them, and, in the absence of her Lord, she experiences so great a sense of loneliness, that all created things serve only to render her grief more bitter. She cannot place her rest in any joy; she *longs with all her might to see her chains broken* at last; and there can be no doubt that in these brief moments, her life is really in great peril. . . . When the divine Beauty touches some holy souls, it at once leaves in them the sting of an intolerable desire; so that, wearied with the present life, they cry out: 'Woe is me that my sojourning is prolonged' (Ps. cxix. 5); 'When shall I come and appear before the face of God' (Ps. xli. 3). And again: 'My soul hath thirsted after the strong living God' (Ps. xli. 5). Thus this life becomes to the saints a burden and earth as though it were a prison; in fact, those saints, whose souls had been wounded by the desire of God, were able only with difficulty to restrain the impetuosity of their transports.<sup>2</sup>

Few, alas! are filled with this ardent and vehement longing, because few take the trouble to meditate earnestly and perseveringly upon God, and His divine perfections, which alone can inflame the heart and set the desires on fire. Of course we cannot know God adequately, least of all in this life, for, as St. John reminds us,

No creature whatever, in Heaven or on earth, no forms or images, natural or supernatural, cognizable by our faculties, however noble they may be, present any comparison or proportion with the Being of God; because neither genus nor species includes Him. And in this life the soul of man is incapable of comprehending clearly and distinctly anything that cannot be classed under genus and species. This is why St. John (Evangelist) said, 'No man hath seen God at any time' (i. 18) and Isaias and St. Paul, 'Neither hath it entered into the heart of man' (Isaias lxiv. 4 and 1 Cor. ii. 9). And God Himself has said, 'Man shall not see Me and live' (Exodus xxxiii. 20).

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 415.

<sup>2</sup> *The Spiritual Life and Prayer*, translated from the French by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, p. 294.

But though an *adequate* knowledge of God is impossible in this life, yet some degree of knowledge is not only possible but essential ; for without *some* knowledge of Him it would be wholly impossible either to love Him or even to fear Him. Such knowledge we possess : it is the knowledge that faith supplies, and that may be enormously increased by the study and reading of spiritual writers. The need of this is very obvious, and it is a need which every earnest soul will endeavour to supply. That a truly loving soul will naturally and instinctively make use of *every means in its power* to grow more and more fully acquainted with the perfections and attributes of God is quaintly though very forcibly suggested by the following illustration from the pen of the famous Italian preacher Father Paul Segneri, S.J. :—

If [he says] a girl of noble family residing in France were to be betrothed to an Italian gentleman living in Italy, she would certainly make enquiries from those of her relations who returned from Italy concerning him. If they all agreed in affirming that in the whole of Italy there was no knight to compare with him ; that he was handsome, amiable, well-disposed, and without the least defect ; that his manner won the heart, his speech charmed the mind, and that he possessed all other gifts in a high degree : if further the bride should hear this from the first who should return to France from Italy, and if she should hear it repeated again and again, with still greater emphasis, by others, how eagerly she would wish for him to send for her speedily. How she would look for his messengers and wait for his galleys. How eagerly she would keep asking herself, ‘ When, oh, when, shall I see him ? ’

Then Padre Segneri, applying the parable, cries out :—

Dearest Jesus, Thou art in Heaven and from Heaven Thou hast deigned to wed this poor soul of mine dwelling upon earth. I have the earnest of these sweet espousals, my Benefactor, in that Thou hast given me Holy Baptism, etc. From those whom I can ask about Thee, I hear things beyond the imagination of such as have not seen them. They tell me that a hundred suns united would not equal the brightness of Thy face. St. Teresa, who saw only Thy hands, tells me that she was wrapt in ecstasy for several days at the sight. Those who have heard Thee speak, inform me that Thou canst bind every heart by the sound of Thy voice.

And so he continues, adding much more to the same effect. When at last he breaks off, it is only to cry out in admiration,

O ! I understand now why Catherine of Siena, Magdalene de Pazzi, Gertrude, Teresa, and Thy numerous other loving virgins could live no longer on earth ; since they knew themselves to be Thy Spouses, and were aware of Thy rare beauty.



It is, of course, natural for every creature to tend towards the end of its creation. And man is no exception. Since, then, man has been made expressly to love, serve, praise, and possess and enjoy God, for all eternity in Heaven, and has even received special powers and capacities that can never be satisfied until death has opened his eyes to the Beatific Vision, it would seem but natural that man should look forward eagerly to the end of his period of earthly probation, and that he should welcome death right gladly as his best friend and deliverer. And this seems to be the sentiment, too, of wise and saintly men. Some go much further, and regard this longing after the fruition of God as a sign of exceptional virtue and perfection.

Thus, Cardinal Vives, O.M.Cap., enumerates among ‘*praecipui actus charitatis*,—‘*Desiderare perfectionem in via, et majorem gloriam in patria et quam citius*’—(p. 308). A few pages further on (p. 334) he writes :—

Valde expedit ut quisquis in mediocri dispositione invenitur, *mortem desideret*, ut a periculis mundi liberetur et Deo perfruatur, ut Deum melius securiusque diligat. . . . Si ardentius desideraremus Deum in coelis quamcitius videre, major esset cordis nostri ardor ad Deum diligendum et mundum aspernendum.

Cardinal Vives then goes on to quote, with approval, the following words from Cardinal Hugo :—

Quadruplex est charitas : incipiens, quae nascitur ; proficiens, quae nutritur ; perfecta quae roboratur ; *perfectissima quae mortem desiderat*. Perfectus amator cupit dissolvi et esse cum Christo.<sup>1</sup>

So that these two saintly Cardinals would like to see us all filled with a distaste for this life, and with an ardent thirst for the life to come. May God grant it !

✠ JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

<sup>1</sup> Vide *Compendium Theologiae Ascetico-mysticae*. Auctore Fr. Josepho Calasanctio Card. Vives.

# PROFIT-SHARING

AS IT AFFECTS THE RELATIONS OF LABOUR AND CAPITAL

REV. P. J. VESEY, S.T.L.

Grave economical disputes in more than one country have long been raging ; peace and concord are affected ; the violence of the disputants grows every day ; insomuch that the thoughts of the wiser part are laden with doubt and apprehension.<sup>1</sup>

THE war-weary world is in a ferment of social and industrial unrest. In every department of life, but particularly in the domain of economics, old beliefs are being challenged, old institutions bitterly assailed. The spirit of revolutionary change is in the air. This development was not unforeseen. For a century at least there have been voices crying that much was wrong with our modern industrial organization, and that a readjustment was imperative. The ruling classes, however, who might have done much to obviate the growing discontent, turned deaf ears to those warnings, and, entrenched behind wealth, privilege and prejudice, complacently awaited developments. Their complacency has now been rudely shocked.

The masses, growing ever more restive under existing social and economic conditions, more conscious of their own power, have steadily organized their forces for a grand assault on wealth and privilege ; and from Russia we hear the rumblings which presage the world-wide storm. In fine, society is divided into two hostile camps—Capital and Labour—prepared for war *à l'outrance*.

Is there a way out of the impasse ? That is the question of supreme importance at the present moment. There are many who do not yet despair of finding a peaceful solution of the social problem by effecting a compromise between the extravagant demands of labour on the one hand and the obtuse determination of capital to cling to its vested privileges on the other.

In this spirit advocates of Profit-Sharing propose their

<sup>1</sup> Leo XIII, *Encyclical Graves de Commune*.



scheme, and in this light we must estimate its possibilities. At the outset it is of vital importance to get a clear conception of the end in view : the disease must be carefully diagnosed before a remedy is prescribed. Now, the social problem is complex and many-sided, but the trouble may be traced to the prevailing inequitable distribution of wealth with consequent ill-advised social classification. This is the root-grievance, and its elimination must be the motive force of any comprehensive scheme of reform.

The whole discussion, then, resolves itself into an enquiry as to whether Profit-Sharing extensively applied would bring about a wider diffusion of wealth and a levelling of class distinctions. The question is primarily an economic one, but it has religious and ethical aspects as well, and as such we propose to discuss it in the light of the social teaching of Christ and His Church. It is our contention that if the world had not forgotten or despised that teaching the present situation would never have arisen.

The labour problem was still in its infancy when the great industrial countries flung off the yoke of Church authority and substituted the Lutheran principle of individualism which has moulded and inspired modern capitalism. Religion was restrained from exercising a leavening influence on social and industrial relation, with what results we have seen. Since Leo XIII issued his famous Encyclicals there has, however, been a steadily growing disposition to hearken to the Church when she propounds her theories of social economy, and her social economy is clear and precise, though essentially simple. Rich and poor, according to her teaching, belong equally to the providential plan. Each needs the other for its mutual satisfaction. The rich are the stewards of the poor, according to the traditional doctrine. The superfluous wealth of the former should go to alleviate the distress of the latter.<sup>1</sup>

Are those traditional principles reflected in the scheme known as Profit-Sharing? May we regard it as an acceptable and adequate method of social reform, and if not what suggestions have we to make towards replacing or developing it? The answer to those questions will appear as the discussion proceeds. Meanwhile it is first expedient that we properly adjust our perspective. We have seen that the

<sup>1</sup> *Summa* of St. Thomas, II. II. Q. 66. Art. 2.

real grievance which clamours for solution is the inequitable distribution of wealth with consequent unacceptable social classification, but to understand the true inwardness of this problem we must touch at least cursorily on the manner in which it has evolved. An historical retrospect is therefore interesting and pertinent.

We may trace the social problem back into the twilight of history : it has but developed new aspects and phases in the course of time, and in keeping with the growing complexity of civilization. On the hill-tops of Judaea, before the dawn of our era, the Hebrew prophets had occasion to proclaim a comprehensive scheme of social duty. In words of rugged eloquence and of eternal verity they insisted that masters and landowners should respect the dignity of their servants and workmen.<sup>1</sup>

The ruling caste were prone then as now to monopolize power and wealth—‘to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself.’ The Pagan world into which Christianity was born had its problem of slave-status—the prolific source of intermittent war. Christianity sealed the doom of slavery by teaching that before God there is no distinction of persons, no classification into slaves and free-men. In the wake of slavery came the system of feudal serfdom, which, though in itself little better, was gradually purged of its defects by the influence of religion.

This system in turn yielded to an order based on the relation of wage-service entailing for the masses an insecurity of status under the government of the few. This is precisely the defect of our modern system ; this is the grievance which must be removed if we want industrial peace and stability. It is not that the working classes are worse off in material conditions than heretofore (the contrary is indeed the fact), but formerly they were happy in the unconsciousness of unborn wants whilst they are now restless with the consciousness of growing aspirations. Far from seeing their material condition grow worse with the progress of industry, peasants and artisans are the two classes of society which, relatively, have benefited most by the increase of wealth.

It has been shown by expert calculation that in the half-century ending 1883 the income of the working classes

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Amos iv., vi., and others.



had increased individually about 100 per cent.; and yet it was in this period that their demands took definite shape and assumed international importance. The antinomy may be solved by a reference to two features of the period immediately preceding 1883, namely, the revolution effected in industry by the invention of more productive machinery and the concomitant revolution in social ideas engendered by the teaching of the French Revolution. As a result of the former, capital became indefinitely more productive; while the lesson of the latter inspired the masses to demand not only higher wages but a voice in industrial government and control.

Add to all this the fact that during five years of war the workers of the world have had it dinned incessantly into their ears that on their efforts in field, factory, and transport-service depended victory or defeat; whilst the rising tide of their discontent with existent social and economic conditions was stemmed by increased wages and lavish promises of a new era to be born of post-war social reconstruction—and you have an ominous epitome of the situation as it now presents itself.

The minimum demand of labour, then, is a larger share in the product of industry, and an effective voice in industrial government, and the question for us is whether this demand is just, and if so is it adequately answered by a general application of Profit-Sharing?

We have no hesitation in answering that the demand is just. The goods of the earth were intended by God to satisfy the requirements of the whole human race, and it was no part of the Divine design that the sources of supply and means of production should be concentrated in the hands of a few. Nay, Christ implicitly deprecates this when He warned men that abundant wealth is an obstacle to salvation (Matthew xix. 23, 24). Furthermore, the labourer is worthy of his hire, and labour is not adequately recompensed for its share in production by any mere wage pittance whilst capital reaps inflated profits. We are not disposed to accept the extreme view that labour is the sole factor in production, but following Leo XIII we think that in general it is the most important factor.<sup>1</sup> Why, then, should the capitalist employers pocket nearly the whole profits, as is now the general rule?

<sup>1</sup> 'By the labour of the working-man States grow rich'—*Rerum Novarum*, cf. *passim*.

Let us see whether the scheme under discussion tends to establish a more equitable balance. Profit-Sharing, in the narrow strict acceptance of the term, is 'confined to those cases in which an employer agrees with his employees that they shall receive impartial remuneration of their labour, and in addition to their ordinary wages, a share fixed beforehand in the profits of the undertaking to which the profit-sharing scheme relates.'<sup>1</sup>

This system is sometimes spoken of by the writer on economics as synonymous with Industrial Co-Partnership, and for that reason we cannot lose sight of the latter system in discussing the former. Now, the essential point about Profit-Sharing is that under its operation the employees have the same status as hitherto, their remuneration alone improving wherever the profits reach a certain level. Co-Partnership involves much more. According to the manifesto of the British Labour Co-Partnership Association published in 1911, it involves :—

(a) That the workers should receive, in addition to the standard wages of the trade, some share in the final profits of the business or the economy of production ; and (b) that the worker should accumulate his share of the profit or part thereof in the capital of the business employing him, thus gaining the ordinary rights and responsibility of a shareholder.

The one system, however, shades off almost imperceptibly into the other, and hence the confusion of terms. Nor is either system a recent invention. In fact Profit-Sharing boasts a hoary antiquity, having been employed time out of mind in agricultural and fishing pursuits. However, it was only about the middle of the last century that it was seriously proposed by social reformers as a remedy for existing unrest. Subsequently it has had a considerable vogue in England and France, and to a lesser extent in the United States.

According to a Report issued by the Labour Department of the Board of Trade in 1912, there were at that time 133 Profit-Sharing businesses in Great Britain with over one hundred thousand employees. We have thus a fairly wide range of past experiment and experience on which to base our estimate of the scheme. How, then, are the relations of labour and capital affected by its adoption in any particular instance ?

Assuming that a standard wage is paid to labour, we see

<sup>1</sup> Devas, *Political Economy*.



at once that the employees of a Profit-Sharing concern are materially better off than their fellows in an ordinary business—at least to the extent of the profits accruing as their share. To that extent, therefore, it tends to satisfy one part of the labour demand, namely, an increased share in the economy of production. But that it does not adequately satisfy even this partial demand may be demonstrated by an analysis of a typical instance.

The managers of a certain business contract to disburse among their employees, in addition to their ordinary wages, say one-half of the total profits exceeding five per cent. on capital. At the end of the year a certain profit has accrued, but before this is available for distribution allowances must be made for depreciation, development, and reserve, and then capital has to be assigned its fixed minimum rate of interest. Now; this implies that labour's extra remuneration is subject to serious fluctuations and may, in fact, through inefficient management or depression in trade, sometimes amount to nothing worthy of serious consideration.

This is one serious defect of Profit-Sharing, but as a scheme proposed to solve the industrial and social problem it has another and more serious weakness. We have seen that the moderate and legitimate demand of labour is twofold, viz., a greater share in the wealth produced and an effective voice in industrial control. If they sought merely a greater share in the economy of production they have at hand in Trade Unionism a powerful weapon to enforce their demand, but they are alive to the fact that increased remuneration paid as mere wages does not solve their grievance. The fatuity of this assumption is manifest from war-time experience. The workers received during five years hugely inflated wages, but it is a notorious fact that they burned with reckless prodigality the surplus above a living wage.

The fault then lies in the wage-system itself; <sup>1</sup> it encourages and almost entails a mere hand-to-mouth existence. Some modification must be introduced to obviate this defect in our system, and Profit-Sharing alone does not suffice. It is almost tantamount to a mere rise in wages, and no matter how wages increase, half of the labour demand still remains unsatisfied. Political democracy,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Rerum Novarum*. In tracing the causes of industrial and social unrest, Leo XIII significantly says: 'To this must be added the custom of working by contract.'

which is the order of the day, demands as its necessary complement complete industrial democracy. Sooner or later this dream will be realized either through political action or revolution. Political action is, however, slow and progressive, and hence the danger of recourse to revolutionary methods unless it is anticipated by the adoption of some scheme which labour views with favour. It is the considered judgment of most writers on Economics that Profit-Sharing alone is not adequate.<sup>1</sup> Some few authorities<sup>2</sup> have, indeed, hailed its adoption as the harbinger of a new and blessed era in industrial life, but the consensus of opinion is dead against them.

Were it really a panacea, so many schemes would not have been abandoned in recent years.<sup>3</sup> The fact is that simple Profit-Sharing is losing favour, and is being gradually superseded by a scheme which, while it includes it, is wider and more democratic, viz., Industrial Co-Partnership. The pioneers of Profit-Sharing in the different countries realized very soon the essential defect in their scheme and developed it in harmony with the awakened demands of democracy for a voice in industrial control. Thus the celebrated 'Maison Léclaire,' has carried Profit-Sharing a long way on the road not merely to Co-Partnership but to complete democracy in industry.

The London Gas Companies, too, which started with simple Profit-Sharing, have now developed their scheme into Co-Partnership. In 1889 the South Metropolitan Gas Co. started with a simple scheme of Profit-Sharing, and we now find the employees holding share-capital, value half-a-million, and having the right to elect several representatives on the board of directors. The N. O. Nelson Manufacturing Co. of St. Louis, U.S.A., has progressed along the same lines. Which goes to show not only the intrinsic weakness of Profit-Sharing as a scheme for social betterment but also its possibilities when allowed free scope for development.

Before we proceed to indicate its possibilities, however, one other point demands elaboration. In many instances in the past the adoption of Profit-Sharing has been dictated by a desire on the part of the employers to detach

<sup>1</sup> Devas, Marshall, Williams.

<sup>2</sup> Jevons and Fawcett.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Report of Labour Dept. of Board of Trade*, 1912.



their men from Trade Unions by a promise of special rewards, and at the same time to reap greater profits themselves by fostering zeal and carefulness. Hence Trade Unionists have looked askance at the scheme and objected, that it is merely a device to 'speed up' efficiency and exact much more work from the employees for slightly increased remuneration.

Now, Trade Unionism is a force to be reckoned with in the modern world, and any attempt to weaken it by a flank attack only adds to the general industrial unrest. The workers have a natural right<sup>1</sup> to combine in such associations, and designs to render this right nugatory and ineffective are not only inexpedient but unjust. This aspect of the case, however, is not so pronounced at present, and as a result the attitude of Trade Unionists towards Profit-Sharing is now more sympathetic than formerly.<sup>2</sup>

The time, then, is ripe for the adoption of the scheme, and the question resolves itself into this: Is the scheme worthy of adoption? We have emphasized its defects as a panacea for the labour problem, but its merits (as a preparatory measure) have also been insinuated, and we are of opinion that if employers in general adopt generous schemes of Profit-Sharing, free to develop gradually into Co-Partnership, social justice may yet rule the earth. It is significant that we hear no more about labour troubles at Port Sunlight, Maison Léclair or the Nelson Manufacturing Co., where the employees, through Profit-Sharing and Co-Partnership, have come to enjoy a more assured competence, and a better social status.

But if employers refuse to see their duty, or recognize but disregard it, what is to be done?

It is as vain [writes Father Husslein, S.J.<sup>3</sup>] to hope for the conversion of the dominant class of selfish capitalists as to depend upon the method of social revolutionaries who would overturn the pillars of authority and plunge the world into hopeless anarchy. The fair-minded employer is beset by unconscionable competitors. Labour may in turn become tyrannical, and abuse its power to the detriment of the consumer and the unskilled operator. Of this we have had examples in the past. Hence we have only State legislation to depend on.

<sup>1</sup> Recognized and vindicated in *Rerum Novarum*.

<sup>2</sup> We learn at the time of writing that the Drapers' Assistants' Union in Dublin are demanding the adoption of Profit-Sharing in that line of business.

<sup>3</sup> *The World Problem*.

State intervention in this domain has always been sanctioned by the Church. In the Middle Ages, when Faith ruled supreme, minute regulations governing the relations and relative remuneration of employer and employee were drawn up by the guildsmen under the aegis of the Church, and enforced by secular authority. And Leo XIII, though anxious to limit the expansion of the principle of State interference, has insisted on its application in this connexion.

The laws should forestall and prevent such troubles (strikes, etc.) from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between employers and employed.

Now, we have already shown that such conflicts are inevitable so long as labour is denied a greater share in the economy of wealth and some share at least in industrial control. Social legislation, then, should aim at the attainment of that object. In this connexion a reference to certain proposals discussed by the French Chamber of Deputies in 1913 is of more than passing interest. Arising out of the question of the formation of a new kind of company (*sociétés à participation ouvrière*) it was proposed that the law legalizing their formation should provide that one-fifth of the shares be the collective property of permanent employees, and one-fourth of the board of directors be representatives of the workmen. Whatever political economists may say about the merits of those proposals, legislative measures along such lines would contribute much towards any lasting solution of the social problem. Hitherto our legislators have merely tinkered with the question. Social legislation in England, for instance, has been merely haphazard and guided by no fixed principle.

A typical instance is the Old Age Pensions Act. The enactment of such a law tacitly admits that its beneficiaries during their spring-tide of life are not in receipt of a sufficient income to make due provision for the uncertain future. In other words, such legislation merely touches the fringe of the evil instead of striking at its very roots. The only worthy aim is a wider diffusion of wealth and a transference of a due share in the government of industry to the masses.

The interest of the consumer, too, may not be forgotten



in any endeavour to equitably adjust the relations of labour and capital. Here, too, Government supervision is of great importance. We are not now concerned with economic theories of Just Price, but contrary to the old theories we hold that free competition is not always a safe index of morally just price. Competition sometimes needs a salutary control by Government in the absence of which the manufacturer and middleman are apt to forget the interests of the community at large. In this connexion a word about the Co-operative movement is not out of place. It goes further than Profit-Sharing and Co-Partnership in giving expression to the demands of democracy, but it is the logical complement of those schemes.

So far the principle has been at work only in the domain of distribution seeking the interests of the consumer by elimination of the middleman. Co-operative stores are a feature of our time, and the consumer has undoubtedly gained much by the innovation. The consumer is, however, only one factor in the problem, and if the co-operative movement is to attain signal success it must concentrate on production also. This has been achieved to a certain extent in Denmark. The whole country is Co-operatively organized with regard to agricultural produce, and the result is that Danish produce is placed on the markets of the world at a lower price than that of other countries, where a series of middlemen intervene between the producer and his market.

We may expect, then, to see the co-operative principle extended in like manner in other countries, but outside the sphere of agricultural produce economists are not enamoured of its prospects. They hold, and we think rightly, that there are certain industries involving huge capital and grave risk where individual initiative is the lever of progress. We may, then, discern different tendencies at work in the industrial world of our day, and assuming that these will run their natural course we may make them the basis of our conclusions. That there are certain industries which are most expeditiously directed by the State or municipal authority is in our day a truism.

In the course of time the principle of Nationalization will probably be more widely applied; at the same time the Co-operative movement will gradually acquire fresh accessions of strength; but between those two spheres there is a vast field of industry where the individualistic

régime is necessary for the maintenance of initiative and efficiency. This is not intended as a plea for the permanence of modern capitalism but rather for the preservation of the good points of the present system purged of the evils we have discussed. And this transformation of capitalism may, we think, be effected by an all-round application of Profit-Sharing, developing gradually into full industrial Co-Partnership, within the sphere of capitalistic enterprise. In the transitional stage the watchful superintendence of Government must be invoked to secure that conditions are equitably adjusted from the point of view of consumer, capital, and labour. Later on there would be less need for this strict State supervision; for once the machinery is well in motion natural development will do the rest. Mention of natural development, however, reminds us that we may not expect a definite standardization of economic conditions. In this world nothing is static, nothing final, and in the sphere of economics least of all.

A new invention or a discovery of some natural deposit of undreamt of reproductive capacities might at any moment revolutionize modern industry, and give rise to new industrial and social problems. It needs not the gift of prophecy to say that there will always be a social problem as there ever has been. But while the present conditions persist, the only hope of social justice and industrial peace which we can envisage lies in an extensive application of Profit-Sharing and Co-Partnership on the lines indicated. It is almost a century since Mill ardently advocated this policy, believing firmly that by its adoption

The existing accumulations of Capital might honestly and by a kind of spontaneous process become in the end the joint property of all who participate in their productive employment; a transformation which thus effected would be the nearest approach to social justice and the most beneficial ordering of industrial affairs for the universal good which at present it is possible to foresee.

The same idea is expressed in different form in Leo XIII's Encyclical on the Condition of Labour. He proposes various remedies such as factory laws and higher wages to alleviate the immediate grievances of the working classes; but to render this alleviation permanent, to bridge the chasm between the classes, to secure for the masses



economic independence, he suggests and insists on a wider diffusion of ownership.

Many excellent results will follow from this ; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. . . . A further consequence will result in the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. . . . And a third advantage would spring from this : men would cling to the country in which they were born.<sup>1</sup>

How is this diffusion of ownership to be effected ? Socialism would undoubtedly make for diffused ownership, but it he reprobated on economic and moral grounds. The only alternative is Profit-Sharing and Co-Partnership, and the safety of the future lies in such a progressive movement towards industrial democracy based on the broad general principle of equality of opportunity.

P. J. VESEY.

# DR. MURRAY OF MAYNOOTH

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY

## II

THE *Dublin Review* was dear to the hearts of Irish priests. They knew it was started by Archbishop Wiseman, whom they claimed as a fellow-countryman. Him they loved for his courage, for the great and courageous stand that he made against British bigotry, for his learning, for his achievements, and even for his failures. The *Review* was started with lofty aims, the defence of Catholic interests and the explanation and defence of Catholic doctrines. And then, too, the idol of Ireland, Daniel O'Connell, was one of its promoters. Nowadays, it is quite the correct thing to belittle O'Connell and O'Connell's work. And yet were he and his work so small, so negligible, so stupid, so crafty and so vile as to merit the wholesale abuse and damning criticism of modern political philosophers? Did the clergy of his Ireland think him a fool, or a knave, or a blunderer? To them he sent this circular:—

16 Pall Mall,

LONDON, 19th Feb., 1838.

REVEREND SIR,—I beg leave very respectfully to call your attention to the *Dublin Review*, of which I am one of the proprietors.

The object with which this publication was instituted was and is to afford the Catholic literature of these countries a fair and legitimate mode of exhibiting itself to the people of the British Empire, and especially to the people of Ireland in the shape most likely to produce a permanent as well as a useful effect. The other quarterly publications are in the hands either of avowed and malignant enemies of Catholicity, or of what is worse, insidious and pretended friends, who affect a false liberality at the expense of Catholic doctrines.

The *Dublin Review* though not intended for purely polemical discussion, contains many articles of the deepest interest to the well-informed Catholic disputant. The name of Dr. Wiseman, who is also a proprietor of the work, insures the orthodoxy of the opinions contained in it, and will be admitted to be in itself a pledge of the extent and depth and variety of its scientific as well as theological information.

To sustain this publication, which while Catholicity is assailed by so



many virulent enemies, and has so few friends among the periodical literature, appearing to me to be an object of considerable importance, it will be necessary to increase its circulation and augment the number of purchasers. It is for this purpose that I respectfully solicit your aid and friendly co-operation.

I have the honour to be, your most faithful servant,

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

Whether this appeal augmented the number of purchasers I cannot say. Priests were in wretched poverty; generally, they were not reading men. But they all loved O'Connell, and probably many scraped together the sum required for the annual subscription. The *Review* was one of the labours and anxieties of Dr. Wiseman. Through it he got into touch with Dr. Russell of Maynooth, and he enlisted the services of his brilliant young professors, Dr. Kelly, Father Patrick Murray, and Father George Crolly of Maynooth. Wonderful are God's ways. Here were three young Irish priests, men, who had got a poor training in letters, philosophy, and even in theology, starting to defend their Church and her teaching, to expound her ethics, her philosophy, her theology, and her history to the men of culture and learning in Protestant England.

To the *Review* the Maynooth staff were loyal, generous and constant contributors. Dr. Russell was a fine essayist, good in matter, refined, polished, and readable. In style so agreeable, choice in word and in theme, he was a credit to his college, a treasure to his editor.

Father Murray was always clear in statement, but often too vigorous and too vehement. The atmosphere of polemics in which he lived and breathed was bracing, venomous, and outrageously unfair, and the good old professor in one of his essays laments his over-zealous vehemence and makes a resolution *non peccandi de caetero*. Still his work bears the stamp of originality. His style is luminous and pleasant, and of the trio he was by far the most popular writer.

Father George Crolly was apparently the best thinker of the Maynooth reviewers. His essays are logical, thoughtful, profound, and, alas—heavy. His logic was like the logical reasoning of Mr. Casey, the Euclid man, and equally interesting. When he enunciated, expounded, refuted, he had logical sequences, corollaries, sorites, and other pretty thoughts, suitable, to be sure, in the rostrum, but wearisome in the review. The essays in the early *Dublin Review* were unsigned, but in the 'Key' given in the *Irish*

*Monthly*, 1893, the essayists' names are given. It is very interesting to compare the works of these three Ulstermen, writing under the same roof at the same time for the same readers. How differently they thought, how differently they worded their thoughts, their different methods and their very different achievements. Those who wish to contrast the writers may look up the *Dublin Review* (vols. xx-xxi)—'Irish Eloquence' is by Dr. Murray; 'Dr. Kitto's Lost Senses,' by Dr. Russell; 'Hood's Poems,' by Dr. Murray; 'The Church of St. Patrick,' by Dr. Kelly; vol. xxi, 'The Irish Insurrection,' is by Dr. Crolly.

Their writings in the *Dublin* brought the Maynooth men into touch with many of the Tractarians. Murray corresponded with some of them, before and after their conversion, and was several times consulted on moral and dogmatic questions by Dr. Wiseman. The professor was an excellent consultant, clear and prompt in reply, and hence over and over again Dr. Wiseman, writing to Dr. Russell, says: 'Private to all save yourself and Dr. Murray.' 'Kind regards to Dr. Murray.' 'We rely on Dr. Murray for two articles.' 'Give my thanks to Dr. Murray.'<sup>1</sup> 'If the secret history of the *Dublin Review* were known to the public, how strange it would appear. So often on the point of sinking, yet always rescued—it looks as if Heaven regarded it propitiously. No one has an idea of the extent of anxiety, trouble, and sacrifice by which it has been kept up. Kind regards to Dr. Murray.' Again he wrote: 'It is of great importance that the Catholic element of the *Review* should be kept together as much as possible, and as strong an infusion of old Catholicism as possible be kept in it. This I mean for the sake of keeping up confidence from the Catholic body, which will be jealous of seeing the *Review* pass too much into neophyte hands.' Maynooth was staunch. The sound, solid Catholic element was maintained by the fine old guard of Maynooth reviewers. In all his wants Dr. Wiseman turned to them. He wrote: 'We are short of matter, especially light. Cannot you get Mr. Kelly, or Dr. Murray, or others to do something?' *Horresco referens*. The good Archbishop was asking men, daily engaged with the Monophysites, Monothelites, Monatanists, Pelagians, Novatores, Jansenists and other mum-mies, to write on 'light' matters. They complied with

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*, by W. Ward.



his request, and in every copy of the *Dublin Review* Maynooth contributed one, two, or three articles. Several times Dr. Russell and Dr. Murray contribute two essays each to a single issue. Dr. Russell apparently was able to have four or five essays in the making at one and the same time. And Dr. Murray performs a feat, yields to a temptation to write long and well about—airy nothing. Students of the history of the great Irish Famine of 1847 remember that the kind and generous Reform Club of London sent its head cook, M. Soyier, to make nourishing soups for the starving. The Frenchman made two gallons of nourishing (?) and palatable soup from a quarter pound of meat. The Reform Club tasted it and rejoiced. Sane men growled and protested, but the cook said to them that he had often made two gallons of excellent soup without any meat, and that he had ‘on taste,’ at the moment, three soups, two with meat and one without, and he defied ‘the scientific palate’ of his brother artiste ‘to tell which was which.’ Dr. Murray sometimes wrote light, palatable stuff, and when it went ‘on taste’ in the *Dublin Review* the scientific palate was pleased, gratified and comforted by the change of fare.

For thirty years Dr. Murray wrote for the *Dublin*, writing his last essay for it in 1876. For it he had a wonderful love, and was anxious for its vigorous and prosperous career. All Catholics did not love the *Dublin* with equal love. And one of many attacks appeared in Gavan Duffy’s paper, the *Nation*. Murray loved Gavan Duffy, his neighbour from Monaghan town. They were close and intimate friends, although Murray did not favour Duffy’s policy. In reply to the *Nation’s* attack, Dr. Murray wrote this long letter to O’Connell :—

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE,  
March 26<sup>th</sup>, 1843.

HONOURED AND BELOVED SIR,—I know not whether I should offer any apology for the liberty I take in writing this letter to you. Indeed, I think I should not, for you are too good a Catholic to think any apology necessary from a Catholic priest for writing to you upon a subject which he believes to be of some importance to the interests of Ireland and above all of *Catholic* Ireland.

I wish to direct your attention to a letter which appeared in the *Nation* of March 25<sup>th</sup> (yesterday), page 376, on the subject of the *Dublin Review*, and to the undisguised *spirit* which that letter manifests.

Before I go further, however, I think it right that you should know that this letter is written by one who is, and always has been,

your ardent and uncompromising admirer and well wisher. I think it right that you should know this, '*in limine*,' hoping you will thus listen with greater confidence to what I have to say. I can refer you to proofs, which will demonstrate the sincerity of these, my professions, even were you disposed to doubt thereof. I enclose a copy of verses which I wrote nearly three years ago and sent privately—as I did some others of a similar kind—to the editor of the *Vindicator*. Luckily, I preserved the paper containing these. The poetry is very poor—and no wonder, for it was written amid dusty tomes, but the feeling is that of a sincere friend. I wrote them at a time when I did not imagine I would ever become known to you personally or in any other way; when I did not dream of the possibility of my having the honour of writing to you upon this or any other subject; when I had no other prompter, but my own cordial Irish-Catholic feeling. I might refer you also to one of the very few *light* articles I wrote for the *Dublin Review*, the article on 'Moore's Poetry and Prose' in the number for May, 1841. The article is, perhaps, too laudatory; but Moore wrote the Melodies, and that ought not to be forgotten to him, notwithstanding all his faults, and, alas! he has faults. You will see what were my feelings towards you from nearly every page of that article. I might refer to pages 430, 436, 439 and the last paragraph. I refer to those for no other purpose than that you may know that this letter is written not by a masked and pretended but by a sincere friend, who has no motive to flatter or to praise, but the honest conviction of his own mind, the genuine impulse of his heart.

I am sure you will, on reading the letter I refer to in the *Nation*, and the milk-and-water comment on it, see the most false and unfair and malignant spirit manifested towards the *Dublin Review*. The objections of the letter-writer may be reduced to four—1st, that the *Review* is written by Saxons; 2nd, that it is printed in London; 3rd, that it is anti-Irish and anti-Liberal in its articles; 4th, that it is fanatical in its religious principles.

Now as to the *first*. I myself write as often as I can for it. The heavy pressure of my duties here, and the delicacy of my health, prevent me from writing as often as I could wish. I am not at liberty to mention the names of others; but I can say in a *private* letter that there are two other of our professors constant contributors; one of them [Dr. Russell] writes an article for each number, and frequently two articles for one number. I know three other Irish and most respectable and talented priests, and one of them, at least, an out-and-out Repealer (I cannot speak positively for the other two), who write literary articles for it frequently. I need not mention one at least, whom you know yourself. It is true Dr. Wiseman and Dr. Lingard write for it, the former constantly. Just look at the concluding paragraph of Dr. Wiseman's article in the last number on the persecution of the Russian Church; why, it looks like nothing so much as an extract from one of your own speeches—I don't think there is much Saxon in that! Nothing but a malignant desire to find fault could have induced the correspondent of the *Nation* to say that the *Dublin Review* was contributed to by Saxons only. If there are Englishmen writing for it, they are those whom Irishmen (however strong their national antipathy) may be proud to have as fellow-labourers. When you denounce the Saxon, I am sure it is not such Saxons as him who wrote the paragraph I have alluded to you have in your eye. Dr. Wiseman may have his own private opinions on political matters (though as far as I know,



and I know something of the matter, he does not pay much attention at all to political affairs) ; but until he publishes them, and appears openly as a political character, he is surely entitled to the reverence and esteem that is due to a Catholic Bishop (so learned, so eloquent, such a champion of the faith) in every quarter of the globe wherever the banner of Catholicity floats, whether the harp of Erin be emblazoned thereon or not.

As to the *second*. Everyone who knows anything of such matters, and is not stone blind from prejudice, must know that if the *Review* were published in Dublin, or depending (as things are) upon the contributions of Irish writers *only*, it would not stand for six months (a good argument, perhaps, for Repeal).

As to the *third*. Up to the point of open Repeal, I think the *Review* is thoroughly Irish. There are but few political papers in it of late (and, perhaps, so much the better). It is hardly possible for the *Review* to touch upon politics, without offending some section of its supporters. If it professes Repeal, it would lose English support, without which it would infallibly go down ; if it spoke against it, it would lose (and most justly lose) the Irish support. *For my part, if it took up an anti-repeal tone, I would not write a line for it.* The only question, then, can be, is it better for the *Review* to cease at once to exist or to go on as it is, in the sphere of literature, science, theology, history, etc. ?—the only Catholic advocate we have of the kind, against the swarm of monthly and quarterly periodicals that vomit out an eternal stream of blasphemy and slander in every corner of the land, as bad as anything in your own *beloved Times*—vide, as a specimen, the article on ‘Borrow’s Bible in Spain,’ in the last (February) number of the *Edinburgh Review* (the *Liberal Edinburgh* !). My advice, then, to the Editor was to avoid political topics, unless those (and, of course, there are many such) on which all true Catholics agree, and to be cautious of the political articles he received, unless (and I specified this) those which come from your beloved son, the member for Kilkenny or some like sure quarter. It would be desirable that the *Review* should take a higher tone in politics, but better even such as it is than to have no such periodical at all. You are for instalments when you *cannot* get the whole.

\* \* \* \* \*

As to the *fourth* charge, that the *Review* is fanatical in its religious principles. You have no doubt read some of the articles written by Drs. Wiseman and Lingard on theological topics in the *Review*, or some very poor articles by myself, the last of which was in the number of November last, against ‘Palmer on Satisfaction.’ There is certainly no very intolerant tone in any of these. And as to the articles by Dr. Wiseman (though afterwards republished by the Catholic Institute, I will undertake to say that I never read anything in old or modern theologians so solid against the High Church views as these same articles, as far as they go. Gracious heavens! only think of the person calling himself a Catholic denouncing, as fanatical and bigoted, dissertations written by a Catholic Bishop and by doctors and professors of theology in defence of our most holy faith and in a tone of decency, and I will say meekness, and this at a time in a country where the anointed priests of God (it is a beautiful phrase in your mouth) are denounced as demons, jugglers, nuisances, surpliced ruffians, etc., and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, our devotion to the Mother of God, all that is most holy in our eyes are ridiculed, blasphemed, called idolatry.

superstition, trickery to deceive the people etc., etc. *I am an Irishman; I think I love my country;* I would not be an admirer of yours, I would not write this letter to you, if I did not. Yet I would rather see Ireland once more fettered by the penal code; I would rather see the days again return when a price would be set upon my own head the same as upon a wolf's, than that the base and infidel spirit that breathes in that letter to the *Nation* should grow up amongst the people of Ireland. We do not now require to hide our doctrines under a bushel; and why should not the *Dublin Review* have the same liberty of explaining and defending them firmly, which the Protestant Press takes of assailing them fiercely and misrepresenting them? The purpose of the *Dublin Review* (says the correspondent of the *Nation*) 'is to forward theology not freedom': as if to forward theology were a matter for censure and suppression, and not for praise and support; as if to forward theology were not to forward freedom. Read, honoured Sir, the last sentence but one of the letter in the *Nation*. The writer talks of the creed of Robertson and Burns—Robertson, the lying historian, the bosom friend of Hume and other infidels, an infidel himself, the slanderer, the abominable slanderer, of everything Catholic. Burns, a beautiful song writer, but a fellow who had just as much of a religious creed as Rousseau or Boyle—vile drunkard to boot—pretty name for a teetotaler to eulogise! But as for the title of 'qualified paganism, by which the reviewer (who, by the way, is a Scotch advocate, a convert, and who, therefore, knew from experience what he was talking about) designated the Presbyterians of Scotland, why, it is a qualified paganism, and the demon spirit of Calvin and John Knox lives in it to this day, and flows in its veins, and beats in its heart—if it has a heart. What is the spirit of the *Edinburgh Review* but infidel; what is the spirit of all their great writers (and I have read many of them) but infidel? And if the reviewer believes all this, why should he not call a spade a spade?

I admit that it would not perhaps suit for you, for instance, to use such terms in addressing the people, because it is not your object or your business to denounce religious errors as such; but the reviewer was writing on the subject, and he used the terms that best conveyed his mind. Be assured this brace of 'qualified pagans' who write for the *Nation* would, if they dared, speak of your immortal letters to the Wesleyan Methodists in the same terms as they speak of the *Dublin Review*. I will say more—and I speak the sentiments of more than myself—that there are traces distinct enough, of an infidel pen in the same *Nation*. It was not to-day or yesterday, I noticed this. I perceived it almost from the commencement of that paper, and this it was which prevented me from becoming a subscriber to it. I know Mr. Duffy, and I believe him to be an excellent and worthy man, but I more than fear that there is a cloven foot amongst his colleagues.

I did not think I needed an apology for writing to you, but I certainly do owe an apology for writing so much. The great pressure of my occupations here will not allow me time to transcribe and condense what I have said; but I hope you will understand me rough and entangled as is the shape, or rather misshape, into which I have cast my thoughts. I think you would pardon more than this in an Irish priest.

But why do I write to you, honoured Sir, on this topic? It is because I wish that the *Dublin Review* should be kept as a bulwark (such as it is)



against the tremendous assaults which the infidel (I will not call it Protestant), impure, anti-Irish, anti-Catholic press of these countries is making in every form against the Church of Ireland—the Mother which I love with the love of a child. And I think it is most important that you should know the power for good which that periodical would have if its merits were known to the Irish people, and that you should know how false, how insidious, are the sneers and the attacks made against it such as those in the *Nation*. In the next number, please God, I mean to have an article (which already I have half written), the first of a series, in which I mean to exhibit in its true colours the incredibly anti-Catholic spirit of our literature, periodical and other, especially in reference to Ireland. I commence it with an extract from your own ‘Memoir.’ I begin with the article I referred to in the *Edinburgh Review*. I shall then proceed with Hall’s ‘Ireland,’ ‘Carleton’s Traits and Stories,’ etc., etc.

\* \* \* \* \*

But I must conclude. Again I must crave indulgence for the length to which this letter has run. When I began I did not think it would go beyond a sheet. I have marked it ‘private,’ and I wish you would burn it as soon as you read it. My reason for this you will at once guess. You have not more staunch and ardent friends in the world than the professors of this college. We cannot, of course, appear in public as political characters, or speak our sentiments publicly on some points, partly (besides other reasons) because the agitation produced by the public discussions of the politics of the day would take off the minds of the students from study and disturb that repose and concentration of mind which are necessary for the prosecution of theological study. But of what our sentiments are you have the best proof in the answer to the question—Who are most devoted friends and supporters of O’Connell, those who study in Maynooth or elsewhere?

I have the honour to be,

Respected and revered Sir,

Your most devoted servant,

P. A. MURRAY,

*Professor of Theology, Maynooth.*

P.S.—If you were to notice in one of your speeches the *Dublin Review*, and justify its principles and the tone it takes, you would certainly serve the good cause which the *Review* itself is designed to promote. This of course might be done in the same way as you spoke of the works of Carleton, Maxwell, etc. I did not intend to make this suggestion; it struck me since I wrote the above. I may also mention (to show that I have no personal interest in the *Review*) that I ask nothing for what I write, nor do the other professors here, who write for it.<sup>1</sup>

Happily O’Connell did not burn the above letter, and it shows us Father Murray in an interesting light. It shows him as a laborious, patient man who found time and took courage to write such a long letter. We pity O’Connell if he had to read through many such, even when penned by a priest-adorer. In the letter how old-fashioned are the

<sup>1</sup> The O’Connell Papers, *Irish Monthly*, 1884, vol. xii. pp. 151-156.

forms of address and adieu, 'Honoured and Beloved Sir,' 'respected and revered Sir,' and this from a Maynooth professor. Then, too, how odd it sounds to read the glowing terms of affection and esteem; to modern ears it sounds like flattery, of a very blatant, fulsome kind. Yet, such is Father Murray in all his letters, very warm-hearted, outspoken and full of kindly sympathy with his friend and correspondent. The letter shows the anxiety of Maynooth for the *Dublin Review*; the only worthy periodical of Catholic interests in the Kingdom. But when he tells O'Connell that 'respectable' priests write for it, we twentieth-century men smile at his adjective. He rebukes the *Nation*, but he praises his friend Duffy, the editor. And his love for O'Connell tells him that all Maynooth are his staunch and ardent friends, but that the younger members, the students, need repose and concentration of mind for their theological studies, and are politically deaf and dumb. If Father Murray or one of those political deaf mutes had dared to mention politics publicly they should have received severe reprimands in Ireland—for all the Catholic clergy did not love the Liberator—and in England, parliamentary questions and censures fell on the heads of those State-paid clerics. And yet, in his chains and fetters, he asks 'Who are the most devoted friends and supporters of O'Connell, those who study in Maynooth or elsewhere?' He wished O'Connell to know the love and reverence in which he was held in the spot dearest to the writer's heart—Maynooth.

E. J. QUIGLEY.

[To be concluded.]



# THE CANONS REGULAR IN IRELAND

## ST. MARY'S CHURCH, NEW ROSS

By J. B. CULLEN

PREVIOUS to the Protestant Reformation it is estimated that there were upwards of five hundred religious houses in Ireland. Nearly half of these are said to have belonged to, or were administered by, the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. The large proportion of houses and churches accredited to this Order may be accounted for from the fact that such of the early Celtic institutions as had survived the ravages of the Danish and Norse Invasions, in the eighth and ninth centuries, when they came to be re-organized or re-built, gradually adopted the Rule of the Canons Regular. Hitherto the Irish monks followed the rule of SS. Columba, Finnian, Fintan, or other Fathers of the early National Church. This change in the monastic system was approved at Rome in Councils held by Popes Nicholas II and Alexander II, and finally at the Second Œcumenical Council of the Lateran (1139), when it was decreed by Pope Innocent II that all monastic bodies in the Church should conform to certain instructions laid down for religious communities in the Letters of the great St. Augustine. It is from this so-called 'Rule' (*regulus*) that the appellation of *Canons Regular* is derived. The introduction of this reform among the Irish clergy was mainly due to the labours of SS. Malachy and Gelasius of Armagh and of St. Laurence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin.

Congregations of Canons Regular, under various distinguishing titles, had somewhat previously been formed in France—at Avignon, Chartres, Arrosia and other places. These took their distinctive names from the locality in which they lived, or from the special habit they wore, but mostly from the ecclesiastical reformer who had initiated the rule or system of religious discipline they bound themselves to follow. Hence we find the 'White Canons of

Premontre'—'the Canons of St. Victor of Paris'—'the Arrobian Canons'—'the Canons of St. Ives' (Chartres), and other similar organizations. However, the Black Canons of St. Augustine came to be more universally known throughout Christendom and were by far the most numerous body of clergy in Ireland down to the time of the Reformation, after which period they ceased to exist in this country and were never revived.

The constitutions of the *Canonicii Regulares* implied the twofold practice of the Contemplative and the Active Life, and hence it was that although living in community and sharing all property in common they discharged the duties and functions of the secular clergy of our day.

To provide for exigencies that arose in the changes of time, the Regular or Canonical Life was modified and certain sections of the Order were permitted to live apart and in separate houses. The latter were styled, ecclesiastically, '*Canonicii Seculares*'; but the rule of life regarding the daily routine of spiritual exercises such as celebrating Holy Mass, the reading of the canonical hours and observance of customs and discipline, remained unchanged. Several of the Canons Regular were pre-eminent for sanctity and distinguished for learning.<sup>1</sup> They possessed great influence in Church and State, and the priors of their more important houses, both here and in England,—like many of the mitred abbots of other monasteries—sat as barons in Parliament.

The great St. Malachy may be said to have been the first to initiate the adoption of the Rule of St. Augustine in Ireland, by establishing it in the monastery of Down, of which See he was the first Bishop, after the canonical formation of dioceses in accordance with the decrees of the Synod of Rathbreasil—A.D. 1118. Very soon after—

<sup>1</sup> St. Dominic, Founder of the Friar-Preachers, during the first portion of his religious life was a member of the community of the Canons of Osma (Spain)—his native diocese. St. Antony of Padua also, in the early part of his career, entered the Priory of the White Canons of Lisbon—where some of the striking miracles recorded in his life took place.

St. Peter Fourier (1560-1640) joined the Canons of St. Augustine, Chamousey, at the age of twenty, and lived and died in the Order. He was the pioneer in establishing Christian Schools for the Poor, and was Founder of the Canonesses of St. Augustine of Notre Dame. Subsequently St. J. Baptiste de la Salle developed his work in France by founding the '*Frères Chrétiens*' for the voluntary education of youth.

We may lastly name Thomas à Kempis, author of *The Imitation*, as having belonged to the Order of Canons Regular.



wards the Primate, St. Gelasius, installed a community of the Canons in Armagh.

In the year 1163, St. Laurence O'Toole introduced a community of the Order into the Cathedral of Christ's Church, Dublin. These were chosen from the Priory of Arrosia, in Artois (France), now known as the Département du Nord. The congregation of Arrosia, at the time, was considered to present one of the most admirable examples of the new system of clerical reform, and the most suitable for the objects the zealous Archbishop had in view. To put into practice the ideal he contemplated and for the edification of his own clergy, he commenced by adopting the rule of Arrosia himself, and having obtained the permission of the Holy See, he assumed the habit of the Congregation.

These three national saints were the pioneers in the work of re-organizing the shattered fabric of the Irish Church, which had never recovered the calamities that had befallen it during the incursion of the Danes and the incessant turmoils which prevailed in the distracted country for two centuries afterwards. The ecclesiastical reform and better spirit of discipline and piety among the clergy were mainly effected by means of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine—whose rule, as we have said, was gradually adopted throughout the length and breadth of the land, till their houses outnumbered almost twofold those of the other religious Orders that existed in Ireland till the Upheaval of the sixteenth century.

The Canons would seem *not* to have built their priories or churches on the same scale of importance as the religious Orders that sprung up later on. And save those that were raised through the munificence of the native princes, or after the Anglo-Norman Invasion, by the prominent leaders of the Conquest, the remains of only a few are to be met with in good preservation. Their work in the way of building was, we should say, mainly the reconstruction of such churches as escaped total ruin when the Vikings spread desolation over the whole island.

In the olden times, when towns scarcely existed and the population of the country was purely pastoral, those little *kills* or oratories, whose ruins dot our Irish landscapes, were intended to meet the needs of only ten or a dozen families, which number of souls then constituted what we would nowadays call a parish. For, it must be remembered,

the area of parochial divisions or even of dioceses were not mapped out or defined till the twelfth century. Hence it sometimes happens, perhaps, as we travel through the rural districts in Ireland, one is surprised to meet those little chapels and wayside graveyards in such close proximity to each other. Those tiny fanes (but not nearly all) were repaired and added to in the days of the Canons Regular. It is interesting to notice how these buildings were adapted when they came again to be used for divine worship, in what we might style the 'Second Spring' of our ecclesiastical history. In the very ancient oratories the sacred edifice consisted only of a single chamber lighted by a small window in the east wall. These original structures were now made to do duty for chancels or sanctuaries, with naves added on, which afforded greater space and needful accommodation for the faithful.

It may not be irrelevant to our subject to touch briefly on a few instances that occur to us as being illustrative of the extension and renovations that took place in some of those primitive chapels. As an example there is an old church at Cloneamery (Cluan), County Kilkenny, on the left bank of the Nore, not far from the town of Inistioge, which shows perfectly what we refer to. Here the original Oratory founded by St. Brendan in the sixth century measures interiorly 22 ft. 6 in. x 15 ft.; while the dimensions of the thirteenth-century nave are 45 ft. x 15 ft. Thus the aggregate length of the whole structure from east to west became close on 70 feet. The older portion of this building was founded by St. Brendan, when he visited this part of Ireland and gave his name to the adjacent mountain—still called 'Brandon Hill.' It was then, too, the sailor-saint blessed the waters of Nore, which was one of the fifty Irish rivers that he prayed 'might be fishful for ever.'

The church of Cloneamery was served, at the period of which we write, by the Canons of the Priory of Inistioge (about two miles distant), which was one of their conventual houses in South Leinster. It was founded in 1210 by Thomas, Son of Anthony, Seneschal of Leinster. At Clonfert also the remains show the nave and chancel of the old church (St. Brendan's) to have been built at widely different dates, the latter portion being by many centuries the older.

It was also at this period of ecclesiastical revival in Ireland that eye-lit belfries began to be erected on the western gables of the enlarged chapels. Previously, in the



primitive days of Christianity in this country, the faithful were summoned to divine worship by the ringing of hand-bells, of which several specimens may be seen in the National Museum, Dublin. When the Round Towers were later on erected (in the vicinity of churches) these were rung from the topmost chambers. It is said to be almost incredible the distance at which these little bells were heard from the *apertures* of these lofty buildings, which faced the four cardinal points, and whence the prevailing winds wafted the chimes afar. There are several examples of western belfries still to be seen in excellent preservation throughout Ireland. A considerable number may be met with in South Wexford, where those little *kills* were numerous. In this district the Canons Regular had a large settlement at 'Lady's Island,' Broadway. They were also the ministering clergy of Selskar Abbey, Wexford, in which town there were eleven little parishes in the olden days. The ruins of nearly all the respective parochial churches in Wexford may still be traced, some of which are fairly perfect.

The belfry of Howth Abbey, Co. Dublin, is worthy of a passing notice. It has triple eye-lits and it may be appropriate to explain the purposes for which the three bells were used. One was the 'Mass Bell,' another the 'Sanctus,' while the third was the 'Passing bell.' The last-named was tolled when the souls of the faithful were *passing* or had passed to their eternal rest. The so-called abbey (St. Nessen's) was, properly speaking, a priory of the Austin Canons, who had the spiritual care of a great part of the territory of the present North County Dublin. In this digression we have only referred to a few instances of the additions and alterations made in the primitive Irish churches, but there are probably hundreds of other examples to be met with through the whole country.

Here, perhaps, it may be noted that most of the religious communities of women in Ireland, before the Suppression, followed the rule of St. Augustine, and were under the spiritual direction of the Canons of the same Order. During the Norman period a small number of Dominican, Franciscan, Carmelite and Benedictine convents were founded, but only in places where priories or monasteries of these respective Orders already existed.

Apparently the largest conventual establishment of the Canons in this country was that of 'Canon's Island' in

the lower Shannon, opposite the estuary of the Fergus river (County Clare). This house was founded by Donald O'Brien, King of Thomond in the thirteenth century. Its scattered remains are now spread over upwards of a quarter of an acre of ground. The church proper, as far as can be traced, was not very imposing. The most remarkable portions of it standing are the remains of a tall square tower, somewhat of military character. Probably in those days the religious had occasionally to defend themselves against the attacks of pirates or other unwelcome intruders sailing up the Shannon.

This island, which contains upwards of 200 acres of excellent land, was in earlier times the seat of a monastery of the monks of St. Senanus, the seafaring patron of Ireland's noblest river, and from whom the Shannon takes its name.

The Church of St. Mary, Ross, County Wexford, as is evidenced by its interesting ruins, was one of the largest churches administered by the Canons of St. Augustine. In its time it was called 'the Great Church,' a title which clings to its Protestant successor still, as the latter is always locally spoken of as 'the Big Church,' and the surrounding cemetery, 'the Big Churchyard.' From what remains of St. Mary's one can easily perceive that it was once a very imposing and beautiful temple. The choir and transepts are still standing in wonderful preservation, the walls being perfect up to the eave-courses, and the three gables almost intact. The nave and western tower, regretfully, are gone, having been removed in the first years of last century to make room for the plain structure now used for Protestant worship.

St. Mary's was founded by William Marshall the Elder, Earl of Pembroke, and Lord-Palatine of Leinster. The date of its erection is not specifically stated by any of the standard authorities, and in latter days various architects and experts on ecclesiastical archaeology advance diverse conclusions, dating the building according to their personal views from the first to the middle of the thirteenth century.

William Marshall, as most of our readers are aware, espoused Isabella de Clare, the only child of Strongbow and Eva, and granddaughter of Dermot M'Morrough; Isabella was therefore the lineal representative of the Crown of



Leinster, and consequently on his marriage, by right of his wife, the kingship of the south-eastern province devolved on the 'Great Earl of Pembroke' as he is styled in history, which position he enjoyed from 1191 till his death in 1219—almost thirty years.

He and his consort were the co-founders of the Norman town of Rosponte, by which name the place was known for successive centuries, from the circumstance that the first bridge that spanned the River Barrow here was built at the personal expense of the Earl-Marshall.

Pembroke, in his day, was a great benefactor of the Church and erected several religious houses specially in the Counties of Wexford and Kilkenny. He was the founder of the Cistercian Abbey of Tintern, the Priory of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John at Wexford, the Cistercian Abbey of Graigue-na-managh, the Priory of the Hospitallers of St. John, Kilkenny City, and of the Collegiate Church of St. Mary, Rosponte, in whose history we are immediately interested. As the great Earl of Pembroke, from the time of his arrival in Ireland till the castle of Kilkenny was completed by him many years later, made Ross his principal residence, we venture to assume that the church of the Canons Regular in the latter town was the first of his religious foundations.

The date ascribed to Tintern Abbey (Co. Wexford) is the year 1200, so our conclusions—for the reason we have just stated—point to the building of St. Mary's, Ross, as having been commenced at an earlier date, and within the closing decade of the twelfth century. Moreover, the prevailing character of the building is Early English or Lancet style, which was largely adopted in the South of England and Wales (Pembroke's native country) at this particular period. The church is severely plain, a characteristic which was never departed from *exteriorly* in the erection of the whole structure although the interior reveals developments of the later and more elaborate styles of architecture.

The ground-plan of the church is cruciform, a feature which is accentuated by the absence of side aisles. The length of the nave, which, as we have already remarked, was pulled down in 1810, is easily arrived at since the tower with steeple of the present Protestant church was built on the foundations of the former battlemented tower that stood at the west end of the building. The lancet windows of the

nave were placed in 'groups of two,' built slightly apart with a considerable breadth of wall-space between them. In southern parts of Europe this arrangement of windows prevails, in very old churches, such as one meets with at Florence, Ravenna and other cities. But there the wide extent of wall intervening was meant, interiorly, to form the groundwork for frescoes, mosaics or other mural decorations—where coloured glass was seldom or never used. In the North of Europe, however, those spaces were provided for a totally different purpose, namely, for the erection of altar-tombs (or perhaps side-altars), especially in buildings like St. Mary's, Ross, where aisles did not exist. In these cases the builders depended on the effects of stained glass (ever changing its tints in the passing sunlight) for the mural colouring.

It is easy to rebuild, in fancy, the old church of Ross, as it stood in the days of its prime. The interior measurements were as follows: the nave, 100 ft. x 25 ft.; the chancel at the crossing 25 ft. x 25 ft.; the choir or sanctuary, 60 ft. x 25 ft. Thus the extreme length of the building from east to west was 185 feet.

The dimensions of the North Transept are 47 ft. x 25 ft. while those of the South Transept are 57 ft. x 25 ft.; hence the whole cross-width was 129 ft. By way of comparison we call to mind that the church of Dunbrody Abbey, considered in its time to be one of the largest in Ireland, measures 200 feet from east to west—St. Mary's, Ross, was only 15 feet shorter. [Dunbrody church, of itself, took fifty-seven years to be completed.<sup>1</sup>

The architectural features of parts of the interior of St. Mary's, Ross, particularly in the treatment of some of the windows, exemplify the feeling of the Transition from the plain Early English to the more decorated styles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

In the south transept the tall slender pillars, banded with fillets and supporting the moulded arches of the three lancet lights, constitute a very beautiful feature. Remark, on one of the rounded shafts to the left, a fanciful little lizard-like animal is introduced—as if the craftsman who placed it there was playing with his chisel! This is a purely French idea. Off this transept on the east side are two

<sup>1</sup> We are indebted to Mr. Andrew Cullen, builder, New Ross, for the accurate measurements of ground-plan.



small chapels or chantries, which were roofed separately and lighted by narrow double windows. Opposite those on the west wall are two wide arches supported by massive round columns—the capitals of which, as well as the moulded arches springing from them, are enriched with nail-pattern insertions. These arches are now bricked up, but formerly opened into a sort of side aisle having a lean-to roof that rested against the south wall of the nave. The marks of the slanting weatherings are still visible on the outer masonry of the transept. This lateral aisle referred to commanded a full view of the two side-chapels, and was probably used by the laity when they came to pay their devotions before the little shrines. To whom the latter were dedicated we know not, but, undoubtedly, they were chantry-chapels, endowed by benefactors for suffrages to be offered in perpetuity at their altars for the souls of departed members of their kindred. Those chantries were extremely numerous throughout Ireland—in the Ages of Faith.<sup>1</sup>

The south transept of the ‘Great Church,’ as may be seen from the rather lengthened details we have given of it, was evidently the latest part of the completed building. Underneath this transept is an extensive crypt. The deep recesses in the west wall having stone shelves, and the remains of heavy iron hinges on the door cases show that this apartment was used as a treasury for the keeping of valuables—plate, etc.—in connexion with the church above. It was also used for the interment of ecclesiastics.

The northern transept is lighted by three lancet windows, but has no other very distinctive features to arrest our special interest—with the exception of the tombs it contains, to which we shall refer later on in the course of our essay.

The Choir of St. Mary’s is remarkable from its unusual length (60 feet) in comparison with those of the churches which were built in subsequent periods. This peculiarity, however, is indicative of its early date. In Christ’s Church Cathedral, Dublin, which was commenced in the time of Strongbow and St. Laurence O’Toole (1170), the choir

<sup>1</sup> According to Heylin, there were 2,374 chantries in England. Those in Ireland numbered approximately about 900. The custom of reciting the *De Profundis* after Mass (peculiar to Ireland) was instituted, with the approval of the Holy See, on the representation of the Hierarchy, in the Penal days, when the endowments of these chantries were swept away, and the pious intentions of their benefactors could be no longer fulfilled.

was almost equal in extent to the nave. At the restoration of the cathedral in the last century this part was altogether removed when it was replaced by the present short choir, which is hardly an improvement on the old.

But to return. The Sedilia to the right of the former High Altar in St. Mary's is characteristic of the simpler or more severe style that prevailed in the earlier parts of the church. Opposite to it on the Gospel side is a recess, within a depressed Gothic arch, which once contained a monument bearing a recumbent figure. This occupies the position of honour usually reserved, in the Middle Ages, for the monuments of royal personages or of the founders of churches. An old engraving still extant shows the effigy to be that of a knight, clad in ringed armour and wearing the tunic of a Templar, looped up to a girdle at the right side. The feet rested on an animal, resembling those to be seen on the Pembroke tombs, Temple Church, London. This cenotaph was undoubtedly intended to commemorate one of the Earls of Pembroke, three of whom successively bore the title during the period of the building of this church. It was most probably the memorial of William Marshall the Younger—in whose time the choir of St. Mary's was built. He, it may be recalled, married the sister of Henry III, and daughter of King John, by the beautiful Isabella of Angoulême. Like his father, he was a devoted benefactor of the Church. He was the founder of the Dominican Priory, Kilkenny, where he was interred 1231.

The choir of St. Mary's has three lancet windows in the east end, somewhat higher but otherwise similar to those of the transepts. In one of the side walls may be observed a pair of windows side by side, but slightly divided, which correspond exactly with the 'groups of two' we spoke of in our reference to the former nave of the church. At the left hand side is a Gothic doorway—which gave access to this part of the building.

The gable of the choir is surmounted by the Old Cross, which still keeps watch and ward over the Catholic town of Ross—upon which it has looked down for over seven hundred years! We are just thinking, as we write, do the passers-by or the present-day citizens ever revert to the fact that theirs is the only town or city in Ireland that possesses such an ancient memorial of the Faith—in a



*similar position*—intact and unscathed by vandalism or the brunt of time? Truly, the people of Ross should be proud of being the possessors of such a venerable memento in this aged symbol of Calvary's tragedy!<sup>1</sup>

The monuments in the old church are interesting. Within the south transept may be seen the fine altar tomb, erected to John White, Burgess, bearing date 1569. It commemorates a member of an illustrious family, long and honourably connected with the town. Among the civic records—the minute books of the old corporation—the name frequently occurs during the seventeenth century. Some members of this family filled the office of 'Sovereign of Ross'—the title formerly given to the Chief Magistrate, or President of the Municipal Council. We find one Patrick White occupied this position during the years 1687-88 and 1689. He was the first Sovereign to be called 'Mayor' of the town (probably in accordance with the new charter of James II).

The Whites were large merchants and ship-owners who carried on trade with Spain—which was then an important element in the commerce of Ross. The port of this town together with that of Waterford were, at that time, the most considerable centres in Ireland of export to Spain and the Low Countries. Hides, tallow, leather, woven stuffs, etc., were then shipped extensively to the Peninsula—in exchange for wines, fruit, barilla, hemp, and other commodities. The tolls or revenues collected at Ross, for a part of this period, are stated to have been equivalent in our money to £12,000 a year. A branch of the White family was also connected with Waterford, whence, in the Penal days (like many others), some of them went to Spain and settled there, where their descendants are still known under the

<sup>1</sup> During Cromwell's occupation of Ross (1649-52) it is said that one of his soldiers was ordered to mount the roof of St. Mary's and destroy the Cross. However, the unfortunate man, when he reached his goal, and swung his stone hammer in the air to perpetrate the sacrilegious deed, lost his balance, and falling heavily on the ground below was instantaneously killed.

Again, in the Rebellion of 1798, one of the Hessian mercenaries of George III determined to triumph in performing the feat which the Cromwellian trooper failed to accomplish a century and a half before. He, also, no sooner reached the Cross than he fell from the fateful spot, and had his brains dashed out on a tombstone in the churchyard underneath.

22 In after years, when ruin and decay befell St. Mary's, and the ivy asserted its gentle sway over the roofless walls, the 'Irishtown Boys,' summer after summer, fearlessly sealed the gable to trim away the verdure from the surroundings of the Cross, and make sure that the cherished symbol of their faith should never be concealed from view.

translated surname of their Irish ancestors as 'Blanco' (which means *white*).<sup>1</sup>

A beautiful altar-tomb on the north transept is a fine example of monumental art of the sixteenth century. The Latin inscription running round the edge of the slab on top records that is was erected to the memory of 'Peter Butler, by his wife, Margaret Devereux, Bally-Magir, A.D. 1599.' Underneath—the three panels into which the front of the table is divided are specially interesting from the emblematic carvings wrought upon them. Those to the left and right contain, in relief, the emblems of the Sacred Passion, while on the centre panel is portrayed the Sacred Heart surrounded with rays and encircled by the Crown of thorns. All Catholics throughout the Christendom of to-day are familiar with this latter emblem, but it was not so in the sixteenth century, for it must be remembered that St. Margaret Mary Alacoque, the founder and pioneer of the *universal* devotion to the Heart of our Blessed Redeemer, was not born for more than half a century after the date on the monumental altar in old St. Mary's. This incidental reference will, we feel, be interesting to many of our Catholic readers.

A black marble tablet on the west wall in this part of the old church is to the memory of John Dormer and his wife Dorothy Archer. The heraldic shield above the inscription is finely executed and displays the arms quartered of the Dormer and Archer families. Below the epitaph a single but *significant* line is chiselled out and obliterated. This act was said to be the handiwork of one of Cromwell's Puritan followers who religiously objected to prayers for the Dead, and one might add, perhaps, cared less for the supplications of the living? The '*Requiescat*' on the Dormer memorial must have been erased shortly after it was inscribed, since the date on the tablet is 1648, and Oliver the Protector appeared before the walls of Ross in 1649.

<sup>1</sup> With the Ross and Waterford branches of this family the following ecclesiastics were connected, viz.: Fathers Francis, James, John, Peter, Stephen, and Thomas White, who were all members of the Society of Jesus. Their names appear in the Annals (S.J.) respectively under the years, 1611, 1640, 1641, 1646, and 1686. Father Stephen White (1646) is referred to by the Protestant Archbishop Ussher, as being 'a man of exquisite knowledge in the antiquities, not only of Ireland, but also of other nations.' His works were mostly written in refutation of the assertions of Geraldus Cambrensis regarding Ireland. Nearly all those priests were attached, for portions of their ministry, to Jesuit Colleges in Spain, Portugal, and Rome during the Penal times.





From the fine state of preservation the two altar-tombs we have respectively described were left in, it would appear, rather obviously, that Catholic worship was not interfered with in St. Mary's from the time of the Reformation till that of Cromwell. This inference might perhaps be explained, with some reason, from the fact that this church with its endowments was granted by Henry VIII to Piers Butler, first Earl of Ossory and eighth Earl of Ormonde. The latter's family remained true to the Catholic faith till the middle of the seventeenth century. Moreover, all the religious houses in Ross at the period of the Suppression were granted to various members of the House of Ormonde by Henry, and subsequently by Elizabeth, which shows the influence they possessed and the favour in which the Butlers were held by the Tudor Sovereigns. In the Counties of Kilkenny and Tipperary a large amount of church property was also conferred on them by their royal patrons.<sup>1</sup>

It is rather remarkable, too, that on the investment of Ross by Cromwell, when objection was taken to the prayer on the Dormer monument in St. Mary's, that the religious devices on the Butlers' altar-tomb, close by, were not effaced by the Puritan fanatics, as one would imagine that those Catholic emblems would have been even still more offensive to their pious susceptibilities.

We shall touch only on one other monument in this transept. It stands alone, occupying rather a central position in this part of the venerable church, and with it a curious but erroneous legend was formerly associated. For many generations this tomb was regarded as that of a famous heroine who was styled *Rose Mac Cruim*. The knowledge of local history must have—a couple of centuries gone by—sunken to a very low standard indeed among the inhabitants, and tradition would seem to have been forgotten even by itself.

The recumbent figure on the tombs we refer to is depicted in the costume of the Stuart period with a flowing wig, etc., which suggested to the people that the effigy was that of a lady. As the inscription, however, had become

<sup>1</sup> There was a connexion between the Ormonde family and the Tudors. Margaret, daughter and heiress of Thomas, seventh Earl of Ormonde, married Sir William Boleyn. Their son, Thomas, who had been attainted in a previous reign on account of his sympathies with the Lancastrian cause, was restored to his titles and estates by Henry VII in 1487, and became eighth Earl of Ormonde. He married Lady Elizabeth Howard (daughter of the Duke of Norfolk), whose daughter, the ill-fated Anne Boleyn, was mother of Queen Elizabeth.

illegible with the exception of the words ‘ *Ross mic Truin* ’ (the original name of the town), the conclusion arrived at by the old natives was that the tomb marked the grave of an individual named Rose. This popular idea was further developed by the addition that the supposed female was the foundress of the town. It may be that some faint tradition lingered on in the local mind that Ross owed its origin to a celebrated lady—but the identity of poor Isabella of Pembroke, the daughter of Strongbow (who really was the foundress), was then apparently quite forgotten.

Some few years ago the members of the Royal Society of Antiquaries, during one of their excursions, visited the locality, when they solved the myth, and pronounced the tomb in question to be that of a *gantier* (glove-maker) since the effigy bears in its hand a gauntlet—the trademark of that guild. It may be remarked in passing that glove-making was one of the many industries that flourished in Ross from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries.

This closes our notes on the roofless but still interesting remains of the medieval church of St. Mary’s at New Ross.

In a previous part of our paper we referred to tombs probably having existed in the original nave where the wide intervals of wall occurred between the double windows. Of the fact that memorials of the dead—whether on the floor or elsewhere in this early portion of the church—were numerous, there can be no doubt. The present writer remembers being told—more than forty years since—by an elderly but very intelligent inhabitant, that he had often heard *his* father say how, at the time the Protestant church was about to be built, several inscribed tombs were ruthlessly smashed up and their fragments, being of limestone (i.e. Kilkenny marble), sent to the kiln for the purpose of providing mortar for the new building. The desecrated stones, however, refused to be calcined and turned into worthless clinkers! The profane intentions of the contractor were thus frustrated. Who were interred beneath those vanished tombs we have no means of determining now—perhaps some of the saintly Canons who once ministered in old St. Mary’s, or wealthy burghers, or other illustrious citizens of Ross in former times.

A brief review of some of the principal events connected



with St. Mary's Church, from the time of its foundation till it passed out of Catholic hands, must bring our essay to a close. The church was founded, as we have already said, for the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, through the munificence of the 'Great Earl of Pembroke,' towards the end of the twelfth century. Previous to that time the Canons occupied the earlier Celtic monastery of St. Abban and St. Evin, which was situated in the lower part of the town where the 'Abbey School' was built by Sir John Ivory (1713—rebuilt by Corporation 1791).

The first monastery and town that grew up around it were dedicated by St. Abban (sixth century) to the Blessed Virgin, who has been honoured as Patroness of Ross throughout all the centuries that have since gone by.<sup>1</sup>

On the appointment of Patrick Barrett to the See of Ferns by Pope Boniface IX, in the year 1400, this prelate obtained the permission of the Holy See, with the approval of Henry IV, to remove the episcopal seat of the diocese from Ferns to New Ross. The latter town was then in the heyday of its prosperity—an important seaport, the centre of several industries, and of extensive commerce. Moreover, being a fortified town it became a principal seat of English government. Bishop Barrett was at this time Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and as a Minister of the Crown may have considered it expedient to reside in Ross. In 1408 he was authorized by the King to levy subsidies on the shires of Wexford and Kilkenny for the building of his residence, Mountgarrett Castle. It is thought by some that he contributed to the completion of the south transept of St. Mary's church, as the architectural details of this portion of the building express the style of fifteenth-century work. This eminent ecclesiastic belonged to the Order of the Canons Regular, and previous to his becoming Bishop of Ferns was Prior of Kells (County Kilkenny), where he was interred. He died at Ross in 1415.<sup>2</sup>

In the year 825 we read 'Ross-Mic-Truin was raided by the Danes on their way to St. Mullins, when the abbey was sacked,' but it was subsequently restored by the Canons

<sup>1</sup> The titular festival of the parish is the 8th of December (henceforth a Holiday of obligation).

<sup>2</sup> Some parcel of 'Crown lands,' granted by Henry IV for the episcopal maintenance, situated around Ross, faintly perpetuate his memory—such as Bishop's Mills, Barrett's Fields, Bishop's Land, etc. By an interesting coincidence the Carmelite convent, with its enclosed grounds, now occupies portion of the last-named townland (Bishop's Land).

Regular early in the thirteenth century. The votive chapels of St. Mary and St. Evin must have stood on the old site. Whether these continued to be used after the Canons moved to the 'Great Church' in the upper part of the town it is useless to speculate now. However, chapels of the same dedication are mentioned in the *Monasticon Hibernicon* (Archdall) as having been conferred (i.e. their advowsons) by William Marshall the Elder on his foundation, St. John's, Kilkenny, in 1211.<sup>1</sup> Like most of the large ecclesiastical establishments erected during the Middle Ages, the building of St. Mary's Church, Ross, must have extended over many years, and only a portion of it completed in the lifetime of its founder.

The western tower was battlemented and crowned by a low steeple covered with lead, as shown in an old engraving.<sup>2</sup> In the year 1636 a fire occurred, in which the roof of the nave and the tower were damaged, but afterwards repaired. Until Cromwell's time Catholic worship, as we have noted, was evidently not interfered with. At the siege of 1649 General Taaffe held Ross with a garrison of 1,500 men. As we learn from the history of the time, he offered to surrender on certain conditions, one of which was *liberty of conscience*. To this Cromwell replied, 'If by liberty of conscience you mean a liberty to exercise the Mass, it is best to use plain dealing and let you know that where the Parliament have power, that will not be allowed of.' On the 18th of October (1649) the town surrendered.<sup>3</sup> Thence religious ministrations ceased to be performed, for a while

<sup>1</sup> In the Records of Tintern Abbey, under 1308, it is stated, the Abbot sued the Prior of St. John's, Kilkenny, for the advowson of the chapels of St. Mary and St. Evin's, New Ross. It will be remembered both Tintern and Kilkenny were foundations of Marshall the Elder, Earl of Pembroke.

After the Reformation, in the year 1552, a lease of 'the Parsonage of St. Evin and Our Lady's chapels in New Ross,' parcel of the possessions of the Hospital of St. John, Kilkenny, was granted to Rd. Butler, Viscount Mountgarrett, for 21 years, from 1568, at the yearly rent of £6.

<sup>2</sup> See *Memoirs of Grace Family*, where the view is taken from Rosbercon monastery.

<sup>3</sup> In Leigh's MS. History of County Wexford (1684), the writer, referring to St. Mary's Church, Ross, tells that it contained 'a ring of five good bells, untill, that in the late times of usurpation, in the year 1652, they were taken down and imbeasled by one Lieut. Colonel Bechell.' In this manuscript it is also recorded that, 'near Our Lady's Church, aforesaid, was a house for nuns and good gardings attached to it.'

To the east of St. Mary's churchyard the stone frame-work of a few Gothic windows may be seen built up in a wall near the old well, which marks the site of the ancient nunnery. The religious of this house were of the same Order as the Canons and were styled Canonesses of St. Augustine.



at least. That they were resumed again is shown by the *Journal* of the Irish House of Commons, under date 1661 (temp. Chas. II), where the following entry occurs:—

A Committee appointed concerning the funeral of one White of Rosse, where it was alleged 'Mass was publicly celebrated and many idolatrous practices openly used, all being countenanced by the Sovereign of the Town, the Committee reported that such superstitious rites were publicly, even at noon-day, acted, at which Edward Davies, the sovereign, was present with his Ensigns of Magistracy.' The House conceived the offence to be very high and criminal, and the Mayor having declared, on his knees, that he was very sorrowful and that the offence was unknown to him, by reason of the great concourse, was discharged.

As there are no traces of residential buildings having been attached to St. Mary's, it is apparent that the clergy who ministered in the 'Great Church' lived elsewhere. The district of which they had the spiritual care included the present parishes of Old Ross and New Ross, which are now officially described 'the Union of St. Mary's.' In earlier times than the period we write of this ecclesiastical division contained seven small parishes. The parish of Ross was separated from that of Old Ross about 1614 at a Synod held by Archbishop Mathews (Metropolitan of Leinster) in Kilkenny.

During the short reign of James II (1685-1691) liberty of conscience and freedom of religious worship were allowed, even though not sanctioned by law. The accession of William and Mary put an end to the hopes of Catholics. King James, after his defeat at the Boyne, in his flight from Dublin to Duncannon (Co. Wexford) broke his journey at Ross, where he was the guest of Lord Annesley (July 1690). It was on this occasion that Mass was celebrated in St. Mary's Church for the last time.

The laws now made against Catholics exceeded in rigour and severity any framed under Elizabeth or James I.

In 1695 Lord Capel, Earl of Essex, the Viceroy, summoned a Parliament which, in violation of the Treaty of Limerick, passed many penal enactments depriving Papists of nearly all the rights and privileges intended to be secured to them by the articles of that covenant.

The 'Court of Wards' had long since done its work as regards the religion of the Butler family—to one of whom, as we have told, St. Mary's Church, Ross, was granted in 1539. Walter, eleventh Earl of Ormonde, was the last Catholic who held the ancestral title of his noble house. He was a most saintly man, and on account of his continual practice of

prayer was styled 'Walter of the Rosaries.' His son, Lord Thurles, predeceased him in 1619. On the death of the latter his son, who was only nine years old, was placed by his mother under the care of a Catholic tutor at Finchley for his religious education. Nevertheless, James I being anxious that the future head of so powerful a family should be brought up in the Protestant religion, claimed custody of the prospective heir as a royal ward, and had him sent to Lambeth Palace, London, and placed under the guardianship of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Needless to say this procedure on the part of the King was illegal, inasmuch as the eleventh Earl of Ormonde was still living, and survived for upwards of sixteen years afterwards. His grandson and heir had reached his twenty-fifth year, when he became twelfth Earl and afterwards first Duke of Ormonde. He was the first Protestant inheritor of the titles and estates of his family. The ownership of St. Mary's Church with all its belongings thus passed out of Catholic hands, after the long space of almost five hundred years.

There is little more to be added to the story of old St. Mary's. As the portions of its very beautiful ruins still remaining are not open to the public and have to be entered from the vestry-room of the modern church, they have been preserved from desecration and further decay. For the care bestowed on the venerable spot we have graciously to thank its present custodians. As long as the symbol of Catholicity stands, aloft, facing the eastern sunrise, so long will it proclaim its hallowed tale. A threefold tale, forsooth, it is—of Faith, Triumph, and Humiliation,—the hereditary and oft-repeated story of the Cross!

J. B. CULLEN.



# NOTES AND QUERIES

## THEOLOGY

### DATE OF EASTER

REV. DEAR SIR,—I am told there is a movement on foot to have Easter fixed—I mean, attached to a particular day instead of fluctuating, as it does now, within a period of five weeks or so. I am surprised, moreover, to learn that some Catholic authorities are in favour of the scheme. My knowledge of history picked up in college days has grown hazy with time; but I *am* under the impression that this matter was controverted for a long period, that some views regarding it were heretical, and that it was settled definitely by the Church. Taking dogma and discipline into account, *may* a Catholic advocate a change in the system now prevailing?

SACERDOS.

From the point of view of ecclesiastical dogma or discipline, there is no objection whatever, so far as we can see, to a Catholic's advocating the change mentioned by 'Sacerdos.'

It was different in the old days. Different customs prevailed for the first century and a-half as to the day of the week on which the Feast should be celebrated—the Westerns supporting Sunday, the Eastern Quartodecimans Nisan 14th, whether it was Sunday or week-day. When an attempt was made by Pope Soter to settle the matter, a controversy arose that threatened to split the Church into fragments. It raged for over two hundred years; and the names of Polycrates, Irenaeus, Soter and Firmilian, as well as the statutes of Nice, Antioch, Laodicea, and Constantinople, are a sufficient reminder of the ardent zeal and bitter passions it aroused.

And, even when that question was settled, another—more closely connected, perhaps, with 'Sacerdos' query—came to take its place, and to divide the ranks of Churchmen for centuries. What particular cycle should determine the Sunday on which the Feast should fall? This phase of the controversy was of special importance in these two islands: and our readers need not be reminded of the heated conflicts with which the names of so many of our Irish saints are associated.

But that *was* in the old days. The world has grown older and wiser since. In the second stage of the controversy, the protagonists on both sides suffered from defects which modern scientific investigation has

largely remedied. In the first, the point at issue was put forward by some as expressly embodying, and was taken by many others to involve, questions of principle with which it need have had no connexion. Was Nisan 14th and all it implied to overshadow Easter and all it implied; or was the reverse to be the case? That, they said, was the issue—Judaism or Christianity, which? And, of course, on an issue like that every Christian was bound to fight to the death, and might even on occasion be partially excused for exhibiting a ‘*sæva indignatio*.’

But things have changed, Whatever else men have done, they have learned a little more about astronomy. And, as for the questions of principle at stake in the earlier days, *they* have been settled on their merits long since. Minor matters, dates and such like, dissociated from the momentous problems with which they once got entangled, may now be discussed and settled in a cooler atmosphere. The same thing is happening continually in political life. A minor issue is raised, and is thought for a time to involve the whole question of, say, Liberalism against Conservatism. It becomes the storm-centre, and around it all the fights are fought. Anyone stating his views in regard to it is thought thereby to proclaim his allegiance to one party or the other. But after a time it draws apart: and people begin to see that they can hold whatever views they please in regard to it without forfeiting essential principles. Then, as an issue, it loses all importance; the battle-flags are furled and the warriors sleep in peace.

And so it comes to pass that this little point, which once threatened the unity of the Catholic world, may now be decided, in their leisure moments, by the members of a Roman Congregation. The sanction of the Pope would, of course, be required: but, so far as dogma or discipline goes, there would seem to be no reason why he might not give it. And, indeed, the change would seem very advisable. The proposal is mooted already in many civil legislatures, and it would only be fitting that the Church, which inaugurated great changes in the calendar before and dragged Protestant nations slowly after her, should take the initiative this time also. An absolutely fixed Easter we can hardly hope for. Unless great reforms are carried—but even *they* are proposed—Sunday will fall on different dates in different years; and, we may take it, Easter will never move from Sunday. To have it on a week-day would mean going back to a petty Eastern system rejected seventeen centuries ago: it would be a departure from the consistent Western tradition from the earliest days of Christianity, and would involve changes in the ecclesiastical calendar that hardly anything could justify. But, if it were fixed, say, on the Sunday that comes nearest to the 31st of March, the reform would be extremely useful in legal, scholastic, and mercantile circles, and even in the ordinary affairs of every-day life. From the purely ecclesiastical point of view, it would stabilize the Feasts whose dates depend on that of Easter. Perhaps even that would be an advantage. Variety is charming; but the price paid may sometimes be excessive.



## DELEGATION OF CURATES

## I

REV. DEAR SIR,—A parish priest delegates his curates to assist at marriages in the parish, according to Canon 1096. A marriage comes to his church from another parish. One of his curates assists at it, without any reference to Parochus or special delegation from him. Is this marriage valid?

The Parochus in delegating had in view his own people. He did not include outsiders, neither did he exclude them. He simply did not think of them.

PAROCHUS.

## II

REV. DEAR SIR,—A curate is delegated to assist at all marriages in the parish. On one occasion, the bridegroom is anxious to have an extern priest, a relative of his, assist at the marriage. The curate subdelegates the extern, and the latter performs the ceremony. Is the marriage valid?

D. B.

## I

The parish priest grants the 'general' delegation (1096, § 1) that is allowable in the case of curates but not in the case of anyone else. That 'general' delegation implies that, in so far as assistance at marriages is concerned, the curate has exactly the same powers as the parish priest himself. Now the parish priest is expressly empowered to 'assist validly, within the limits of his own territory, at the marriages not merely of his subjects, but also of non-subjects' (1095, § 1, 2°). In the case submitted therefore the curate was qualified to act, and the marriage is valid.

Restrictions might have been imposed. But there is no evidence that any were, and, to paraphrase an old axiom of law, 'quod parochus tacuit noluit, quod voluit expressit.' Indeed, we may say that the evidence shows that restrictions were *not* imposed. The only restrictions that concern us would affect outsiders; and of *them* the parish priest 'simply did not think.'

And, if any little doubt remains, we may appeal to Canon 200. It deals, we admit, with 'jurisdiction,' and the delegated power of assisting at marriages is, technically speaking, merely a 'permission' (1096, § 1). But the two are governed by exactly the same principles. And the canon assures us that 'power of jurisdiction delegated "ad universitatem negotiorum" is to be interpreted in a wide sense'—which means that it covers all cases to which the words in which it is conveyed may, without straining of their natural meaning, be reasonably taken to extend.

## II

'D. B.' will find an answer to his query in an earlier issue.<sup>1</sup>

## BANNIS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I am greatly nonplussed by the canons of the New Code concerning the publications of Banns (1023, § 1); nor do I find much relief or enlightenment from your remarks in I. E. RECORD, 1918, pages 464, etc., and 499 and 319, second part.

I can grasp the theoretical statement well enough, but I don't find it

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, June, 1918, vol. xi. p. 500, 2°.

so easy to utilize it when I come to the practice. May I ask you to lay down, therefore, for us missionary priests, some safe working method to keep us from pitfalls when dealing with the matter? I am aware that many, like myself, will be very grateful to you.

Perhaps it may be no harm to give you some points that occur to me which may serve as finger-posts to direct you in our guidance.

In many dioceses of Ireiand, the practice is to have the Banns not *published* but *dispensed* for the girl and her partner even from another diocese; and the man is required to get a 'Letter of Freedom' (equivalent to Banns) from his parish priest. Is the latter to require a similar letter from every other P.P. in whose parish the man has lived for six months? He may have been in many such places, and may be able to say truthfully, besides, that he had been moving about here and there, and knew not much of priests or they of him. I may remark, too, that it would appear to be a very strong presumption of his being single and free, if no girl has come claiming him for, v.g., six months. Further, if so much proof of his freedom can't be secured, what about having him sworn before a magistrate? Or, if that is not convenient, what of swearing him oneself? I don't know if it is against the civil law to do so (Canon Law seems to allow it in some cases). But even so, may not a P.P. conscientiously risk it?

The difficulty of proof of freedom of course increases when the man has spent some considerable time in foreign parts. What, then, is the course to pursue? I know that a foreign P.P.'s letter with one or two witnesses would suffice, but, if this could not be obtained, what then? Would the aforesaid swearing avail? I have done that sometimes, and with safety. Then again, the second important point:—Is it obligatory on the man's P.P. to acquaint the Bishop of all these enquiries?—as the canons suggest. Does it not seem impracticable, or at least very burthen-some, to have to do so, on all occasions? But perhaps, if once done, the P.P. could avail himself of this (Bishop's) approval in all future cases of a like nature.

Finally, what is to be done, v.g., at the end of Shrove, the very time at which most Irish marriages take place, when often the officiating priest never sees the 'marriages lines' of the man till the moment before marriage: is he justified, then, in acting on the freedom, even of six months only, which he gets?

You have stated on page 498 (I. E. RECORD, 1918), that the Irish custom of dispensing in Banns may still continue. I take it the custom applies to Banns or Certificates of the man as well as of the woman. Is it 'immemorial custom' that justifies that practice?

I must humbly apologise for this long and loose statement.

A SUBSCRIBER.

'Subscriber's' indignation is excusable. We have just been consulting the article he cites, and we must admit that he found very few remarks on the points that trouble him. But, then, the article had to touch on many matters. If we devoted as much attention to each as 'Subscriber' feels we should have done to those he mentions, the article would fill a whole issue of the I. E. RECORD. And there are objections to that.

Anyhow we tried to make amends. In our last January issue <sup>1</sup> we gave

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, vol. xv. pp. 55-61.



our views on several of the points raised, and on the others suggested, by 'Subscriber.' The meaning of 'proper parish priest' in the context, the number of parish priests on whom the obligation of proclaiming Banns rested, the method of dealing with a man who had lived in many places or gone to foreign countries—these and other matters we discussed as best we could. Only we should not be too quick to conclude that a man is single and free merely because 'no girl has come claiming him for, v.g., six months.' There may be obstacles; and, anyhow, even girls have a little patience.

In one of the Roman decisions cited in the reply just mentioned, the policy of administering the oath is expressly recommended in cases like those described by 'Subscriber.' The alternative policy of bringing the man before a civil magistrate has, to our own knowledge, been adopted in many cases with excellent results: it saves the priest from much inconvenience and annoyance if an action for bigamy is ever taken in the civil courts. As for the attitude of English laws to the administration of oaths by private persons, 'Subscriber' will consult a reply given by one of our predecessors many years ago.<sup>1</sup> He will find that the act is a 'misdemeanour,' and that there is no definite penalty affixed. The object of the law, we suspect, was to discountenance any form of judicial trial carried out by any but the recognized servants of the Crown. It would apply much less strictly to the case outlined by our correspondent. For the last dozen years most of us have taken more oaths than we can remember: but, though a small thing is a crime in Ireland now, no steps have been taken against us in the name of civil law.

We are afraid that, when the man has lived for six months or more in another locality, it is obligatory on the parish priest, when looking for a dispensation, to inform the Ordinary, not of all the details of the enquiries, but of the main facts as he knows them (1023, § 2). The obligation arises occasionally even when the man never lived six months in any particular place—in the case, namely, of the 'vagi' (1032). This is certainly true of those who are habitually 'wanderers'; whether it be equally true of those who are so only for the moment we have taken liberty to doubt<sup>2</sup>—for the reasons given by 'Subscriber.'

We are not quite sure that we know the meaning of 'the freedom even of six months only which he gets.' But, whatever it means, the Shrovetide marriages described by our correspondent would seem to be out of harmony with all the regulations. How can the parish priest carry out the tactful examination prescribed in Canon 1020 (§ 2, § 3)—satisfying himself that there is no impediment, that the partners give free consent, that they are sufficiently instructed in Christian doctrine—if he is brought face to face with an utter stranger a 'moment before the marriage,' and if the whole ceremony is rushed in this headlong fashion? There is no need for haste. Marriage may now be contracted 'at any time of the year' (1108, § 1). The pomp and rejoicings will have to be restricted, and the Nuptial blessing will be refused (§ 3, § 2). But, as

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, Fourth Series, 1907, pp. 407-9, 539-41 (5, 6 William IV, c. 62, s. 13).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., Fifth Series, January, 1919, vol. xiv. pp. 63-4.

regards the latter point, the Ordinary is granted extensive faculties by this same canon (1108, § 3), and a subsequent reply of the Congregation of Rites<sup>1</sup> extends them further still.

The Irish custom of dispensing in Banns *does* apply to 'the Banns of the man as well as of the woman.' 'Subscriber's' suggested defence of it is good. The custom of dispensing even when there is no just cause (of the kind understood in general Canon Law) in the individual case, does seem opposed to the canons (1023-8) but, even so, it remains, on the score of its antiquity, if the Ordinary thinks its abolition would entail serious trouble and inconvenience (5). And we may reach the same conclusion by another method. Canon 1028 allows the Ordinary to grant a dispensation when there is a 'legitimate' cause. Now there can be no doubt that the existence of an immemorial custom, and the general outlook it implies, will supply such a 'legitimate' cause, even though the special circumstances of an individual case furnish no cause whatever in themselves.

#### EFFECT OF CODE ON CENSURES ALREADY INCURRED

REV. DEAR SIR,—Might I ask for your opinion on a matter that has given me some trouble in practice during the last two years. Certain (reserved) censures that used to bind have been abolished by the Code. Now, suppose a man had contracted one of these before the Code came into operation—may I absolve him, or must I look for special faculties? It looks absurd to have to go to such trouble about one man, while another who has committed the very same sin recently is absolved without any trouble.

M. H.

When we read this query first, we felt that the reply lay on the surface. Canon 2226, § 3, seemed to meet the case exactly. 'If a subsequent law,' it tells us, 'abolishes a (previous) law or penalty merely, the latter comes to an end at once, *unless there be question of censures already contracted.*' To the case given by 'M. H.' the exceptive clause applies. The censures, therefore, remain as before.

That was our view. It is our view still. But we recognize that some little difficulties may be raised against it. For, in the current number of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* we find some remarks on this very matter, contributed by M. Jomsart.<sup>2</sup> He raises some points that cause a little trouble, though he supports the conclusion already stated.

One of the points is this. All through the Code we must distinguish between the rules of interpretation that govern the Code itself and those that are intended for ecclesiastical legislation generally. In connexion with customs, for instance, we find that none but a gigantic custom can stand against the Code (5), while a comparatively puny rival may offer a sturdy resistance to any other species of ecclesiastical legislation (30). The relation of 'privileges' to the Code is defined in Canon 4; their relation to other laws in Canon 71. And so of other matters.

<sup>1</sup> June, 14, 1918; I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, Nov. 1918, vol. xii. p. 424.

<sup>2</sup> June, 1920, pp. 356-9.



Now, may it not be that Canon 2226 is concerned with the 'other laws,' and that the effect of the Code on censures already contracted is determined by the milder terms of Canon 6, 5°—which abolishes penalties of which the Code says nothing? Possibly. But, as the writer points out, when there *is* question of a difference between the Code and other laws, the Code itself draws special attention to the fact—as in the cases just mentioned. Here the Code does nothing of the kind. It lays down a general principle in Canon 2226, and Canon 6 says nothing to the contrary. For Canon 6 is concerned, not with penalties contracted, but with laws imposing penalties—a very different matter.

Another point suggested is this. Irregularities already contracted cease unless mentioned in the Code. This the writer affirms on the authority of statements made by Cardinal Gasparri in 1893, and we have no wish to challenge it. Should not censures follow the same rule? To which our answer is that irregularities are not penalties at all—only disqualifications like matrimonial impediments—and, therefore, naturally cease when a more favourable law is passed. And, indeed, even though they *were* penalties, they would supply no contradiction to Canon 2226. For it *provides* for the cessation of 'penalties,' with the one exception that affects 'M. H.'

The general indications of the Code point to a continuance of the censures. For example:—

1°. 'Acquired rights' are unaffected by the new legislation (4). To have a perfect parallelism 'acquired disadvantages,' if we are pardoned the expression, should remain also. The argument, we grant, must be applied with caution. For, just as the question of 'acquired rights' is bristling with difficulties, so would the question of 'acquired disadvantages.'

2°. Unless the opposite is stated, laws are not retrospective (10). This principle has already been applied by the Commission to emphasize, say, the invalidity of marriages—contracted before 1918 and invalid then because of an impediment now abolished. The analogy is complete enough to justify our maintaining that the censured individual is not *ipso facto* released.

3°. In Canon 2248, § 1, we are told that 'Every censure whatever (*quaelibet censura*), once contracted, is removed only by legitimate absolution.' The same difficulties might be raised against this, as against our interpretation of Canon 2226, § 3. But the comprehensive character of the statement, and the absence of any clear indication that the Code itself is governed by any rival principle, make it practically certain that the natural interpretation of both canons is correct.

The writer in the *Revue* quotes Suarez<sup>1</sup> and Wernz<sup>2</sup> in support—and quite justifiably, too, for Canon 6 (2°, 3°, 4°) allows us to fall back on pre-Code authority when the occasion demands. But there is no need to labour the point. The pre-Code teaching, so far as we can see, was unanimous: the only question is whether the Code has modified the ancient principles.

<sup>1</sup> *De Cens. et Irreg.*, disp. 20, s. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Jus. Decr.*, t. 4, n. 172.

## ABSOLUTION OF 'PEREGRINI'

## I

REV. DEAR SIR,—Arregui says (page 402 par. 609) : 'A quolibet confessario approbato absolvi potest peregrinus, qui sive in propria sive in aliena diocesi commisit peccatum etiam in utraque reservatum.'

Is that correct? For I have been told that a late decree, authoritatively interpreting the new Code, renders that teaching untenable. If there is such a decree would you be so kind as to refer me to the number of the I. E. RECORD in which it appeared? Or let me know how it modifies the above.

An early reply will oblige.

E. C.

## II

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I venture to trouble you with the following queries *re* your statement in July (1920) *Theological Quarterly*, p. 224: 'The second . . . "Peregrini" are bound by the *special* reservations of the place where the confession is made . . . treats his own subjects.'<sup>1</sup>

1°. What is the binding force on the whole Church of an answer of the Commission to an individual Bishop?

2°. The words of the Cardinal's *quaeritur* are 'an teneatur peregrinus reservationibus loci in quo sit' (I. E. RECORD, Oct. 1919). There is no mention of '*special*' or of 'where the confession is made.' What does '*loci in quo sit*' mean—the place in which the peregrinus is when he sins, or the place where he confesses, or both together? I submit that the answer to the Cardinal would cover only the case of a peregrinus who commits, in a place other than his own, a sin that is reserved there and wishes to be absolved in the same.

3°. Canon 900, 3°, seems to support this view: (a) Suppose A from Cashel commits a sin not reserved there but reserved in Limerick, can a Limerick ordinary confessor absolve him? (b) Suppose A from Cashel commits a sin reserved in Cashel which is also reserved in Limerick, can a Limerick ordinary confessor absolve such a one? According to Canon 900, 3°: 'Extra territorium reservantis "*quaevis* reservatio omni *vi caret*."'

If these questions and your answers can throw any further light on this still vexed question, and you wish to use them for publication, you are quite free to do so.

QUAERITUR.

## I

This matter has already been given more space in our pages than perhaps it deserves.

Though we expressed an admiration for Arregui's book—mainly on account of its method, order, compactness and careful fusion of old and new<sup>2</sup>—we had no intention of suggesting that it gave a full exposition of the teaching of the moralists, or that every statement found in it was correct.

<sup>1</sup> The substance of the statement is that, taking the reply (to the Cardinal) in conjunction with Canon 900, we must hold a 'stranger' bound in the way indicated, and advise confessors to treat externs and subjects alike.

<sup>2</sup> I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, March, 1919, vol. xiii. pp. 256-7.



This one certainly is *not*. It is not merely one degree, but two degrees, from the truth. On the merits of the case, 'E. C.' may consult an earlier issue.<sup>1</sup> There is no decree on the matter. But there is a reply—sent by the Commission to Cardinal Logue—which our correspondent will find in our last October issue.<sup>2</sup>

## II

This second query reaches us just as we go to press, and our time for reply is very limited. It convinces us, by the way, that this particular matter has been receiving more attention than we thought likely when we wrote the last reply.

1°. The answer, we should say, is supplied by Canon 17, § 2. 'If it merely declares (the meaning of) words of the law in themselves certain, it stands in need of no promulgation and is retrospective; if it restricts or extends the law, or explains a law that is doubtful, it is not retrospective and ought to be promulgated.' Not very satisfactory, 'Quaeritur' will say: and we fully agree. For who is to decide whether the answer does, or does not, extend the law as it stood? The controversy which it was intended to settle only enters on another phase.

But we think all will admit that, even though the reply does not constitute a binding law for the whole Church, it furnishes a safe and authorized rule for confessors—whether in Ireland or elsewhere. It represents the highest form of extrinsic evidence procurable. And, in the little country for which it was given, we wonder if anyone will be courageous or rash enough to hold that it may be disregarded with impunity.

In a previous issue<sup>3</sup> we gave our views on the binding force of Roman decrees generally. And what was said there applies, in an equal or even greater measure, to the replies given by the Commission.

2°. 'There is no mention of "special."' No. But why should there be? Everyone is bound by 'general' reservations, no matter where he goes; it is only about 'special' reservations that the query, unless it were absurd, could possibly concern itself. 'No mention of "where the confession is made."' Again we agree. But that is the only possible interpretation. As everyone now admits, reservation is not 'incurred' by a sinner—as, say, a censure or irregularity would be. It affects the confessor and his faculties—the penitent *only when he appeals to that confessor in confession*. So that, if the penitent is 'bound by the reservations of the place,' the meaning is that he will find himself affected *when he actually confesses*.

Whether the sin was committed in the place of confession or not, is a matter of absolute indifference. It has no effect on the confessor's faculties—and that is the test. Neither the query nor reply makes any reference to such a distinction and 'ubi [responsio] non distinguit, neque nos distinguere debemus.'

That was the meaning attached to the query when it left Ireland.

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, Fifth Series, April, 1919, vol. xiii. pp. 324-31.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., October, 1919, pp. 313-14, 330.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., March, 1916, pp. 268-74.

It is the meaning attached to it by the Continental magazines that have commented on the reply, and on the remarks made in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* (October, 1919) on query and reply combined. We subjoin two extracts. The first is from the *Monitore Ecclesiastico* (February, 1920, p. 59):—

La risposta al quarto dubbio è importantissima e chiara ; conferma nel modo più autorevole quanto ragionammo a pag. 150 s. dell'anno passato, ove quindi trovasi sufficiente commento della presente. [There he maintained the view we have adopted on the question.] Si osservi inoltre che la riserva, a norma del can. 897 'consultit ordini publico,' è compresa nell'eccezione del can. 14, § 1, n. 2.

The second from the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (June, 1920, p. 374):—

LES 'PEREGRINI' ET LES CAS RÉSERVÉS.—Ibidem [*I.T.Q.*], sub numero IV.—L'archevêque d'Armagh posait aussi à la Commission le doute suivant :

'An peregrinus teneatur reservationibus loci in quo sit.'

La Commission a répondu : 'Affirmative.'

*Observations.*—Le Code a mis hors de conteste que si un étranger a commis une faute réservée dans son propre diocèse et la confesse dans un autre où cette faute n'est pas réservée, tout confesseur approuvé peut l'absoudre sans facultés spéciales (canon 900, 3°). Cette disposition était conforme à l'origine de la juridiction pénitentielle dans chaque diocèse et à la nature de la réserve, telles que les conçoivent les canons 874 et 893. La réserve est une limitation de pouvoirs que tout Ordinaire est autorisé à faire dans son diocèse et qui affecte directement non le pénitent mais le confesseur 'Possumt nonnullos casus ad suum avocare iudicium, inferioribus absolvendi potestatem limitantes' (canon 893). Et, d'autre part, la juridiction, même à l'égard des étrangers, procède, dans chaque diocèse, ou du droit ou de la délégation de l'Ordinaire de ce diocèse (canon 874 rapproché du canon 873) ; non d'une délégation tacite du propre Ordinaire du pénitent étranger. Par conséquent, si l'Ordinaire du lieu de la confession n'a mis aucune réserve à la juridiction, la juridiction est entière même à l'égard de celui-ci. Mais cette manière de concevoir les choses amenait par réciprocité à une autre conclusion : si un étranger confesse une faute réservée dans le lieu de la confession, il ne peut y être absous sans faculté spéciale—que la faute ait été commise là ou ailleurs, qu'elle soit ou ne soit pas ailleurs réservée ; car le confesseur, dans l'hypothèse, est dépourvu de juridiction sur elle : l'Ordinaire l'a évoquée à son for pénitentiel. Le *peregrinus* est donc atteint par les réserves du lieu où il se trouve, c'est-à-dire du lieu où il se confesse. S'il va se confesser hors de ce lieu, là où la faute n'est pas réservée, la réserve pour lui cessera.

We have taken the liberty of italicizing the sentences that 'Quaeritur' is not inclined to admit.

3°. As regards the two cases :—

(a) The Limerick confessor, we think, cannot absolve him.

(b) Nor this man either. The penitent has *not* left the territory of the Limerick reserving authority (900, § 3).

M. J. O'DONNELL.



## CANON LAW

## BINATION AND PREACHING

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be very grateful if you would enlighten me on the following difficulties: I celebrate two Masses every Sunday—one in a private oratory in the parish in which I minister, and the other in the parochial church itself. At the Mass in the private oratory there are usually about seven or eight present, and none of these attend any other Mass or religious function at which sermons or instructions are given. I want to know:

1°. Is it lawful to binate in the circumstances?

2°. If it is, am I bound to preach in the oratory?

PERPLEXED.

1°. Canon 806 states very concisely the principles governing bination. After declaring in § 1 that, with the exception of Feasts of the Nativity and of the Commemoration of All Souls, a priest cannot celebrate several Masses on the same day without an apostolic indult or a concession of the Local Ordinary, it continues in § 2:

The Ordinary, however, cannot grant this faculty, unless when in his prudence he considers that on account of the scarcity of priests a notable part of the faithful cannot be present at Mass on a feast day of precept; but it is not in his power to permit more than two Masses to the same priest.

The pre-Code discipline was that the Ordinary could not grant permission to celebrate a second Mass except in case of necessity<sup>1</sup>; and, according to the teaching of canonists and theologians and the declarations of Popes and Roman Congregations, the required necessity was verified when a notable part of the faithful would otherwise be deprived of an opportunity of hearing Mass on a Sunday or Holiday of obligation.<sup>2</sup> The new and the old regulations, therefore, are practically coincident; and hence the former must be explained in accordance with the recognized interpretations of the latter.<sup>3</sup> Now, the old teaching was that the Ordinary could not permit bination to meet the convenience of those who wished to hear Mass in their private oratories. On this point Gasparri writes thus: 'Likewise the necessity is not verified, and therefore neither a Vicar-Apostolic nor much less a Bishop can binate or permit the repetition of Mass for the convenience of those who wish to satisfy

<sup>1</sup> C. Contulisti, 3, tit. De cel. Missarum, lib. iii, x.: 'Respondemus, quod, excepto die Nativitatis Dominicæ, nisi causa necessitatis suadeat, sufficit sacerdoti semel in die unam Missam solummodo celebrare.'

<sup>2</sup> cf. Gasparri, *De S. Euch.*, vol. i. n. 378 et sqq.; Many, *De Missa*, n. 28 et sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 6, n. 2°: 'Canones qui jus vetus ex integro referunt, ex veteris juris auctoritate, atque ideo ex receptis apud probatos auctores interpretationibus sunt aestimandi.'

the precept of hearing Mass in their strictly private or domestic chapels.' <sup>1</sup> In confirmation of this statement the author refers to an instruction of the Propaganda, which takes for granted the unlawfulness of permitting bination in the circumstances contemplated.<sup>2</sup>

The reply then to our correspondent's first query is that bination in the circumstances without an apostolic indult is unlawful: the Ordinary cannot give the required permission.

2°. Even though bination is lawful, there is no ecclesiastical law which would require our correspondent to preach in the private oratory: the ecclesiastical laws on preaching, in so far as they affect parish priests and their assistants, embrace only churches and public oratories. At the same time, however, in circumstances of this kind the natural law itself imposes an obligation *in solidum* on the parish priest of the place and his curates to see that these people are properly instructed in the teaching and practice of the Church. So long, however, as this end is attained, the natural law is indifferent as to the means to be adopted for its attainment.

#### HONORARIUM FOR A 'SECOND MASS'

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be very grateful to you for a reply to the following:—

1. Canon 824 says that a priest is not allowed to receive a stipend for a Mass when he has already on the same day said Mass 'Ex titulo justitiae.' In the Maynooth Statutes it is stated that the Irish Bishops obtained from the Holy See a concession for priests in this country to lawfully take a second stipend for the second Mass whenever they should happen to binate. Does this privilege still hold or is it abrogated by the Codex?

2. Would the inconvenience of having to go three miles by car to say a second Mass constitute an extrinsic title to justify a priest in taking a second honorarium for the application of that Mass?

SACERDOS.

1. In his reference to the Maynooth Statutes our correspondent has evidently before his mind n. 111, in which it is stated that:—

Having taken into consideration the circumstances of certain Missions the Supreme Pontiff has granted to the Ordinaries of these Missions that

<sup>1</sup> l.c. n. 385.

<sup>2</sup> 24th May, 1870, apud Coll. S. C. de Prop. Fide, n. 792: 'n. 6. Secundo. Pariter interdicta est Missae iteratio in eorum commodum qui vellent praecepto audiendi Missam satisfacere in suis privatis capellis. Ennaraverat anno 1842 Vicarius Apostolicus Limburgensis consuetudinem in suo Vicariatu inolitam permittendi Missae iterationem in castris magnatorum; quum autem non putaret, his in adjunctis eam necessitatem esse, quae a Formulis exigitur, petiti tum ratione consuetudinis, tum moralis utilitatis quae inde proveniebat, ut sibi auctoritas fieret id permittendi. At S. Congregatio Inquisitionis judicavit, *juxta exposita non expedire*. Quumque subjunisset Vicarius Apostolicus nonnullos sacerdotes ex praehabita facultate ab ejus praedecessore iterationem Missae prosequi, Suprema S. Congregatio decrevit facultatem esse revocandam, quatenus Vicarius Apostolicus Limburgensis prudenter id fieri posse existimet.'



priests subject to them may, for a just and reasonable cause, receive a stipend of this kind (i.e. a stipend for a second Mass). This permission is extended to the Bishops of Ireland.

The basis of this statute is clearly the Encyclical Letter of the Propaganda published in 1863. This document is concerned with the question as to whether it is lawful to receive a stipend for a second Mass in missionary countries, and, after giving a negative answer, it adds the following exception: 'Since, however, in some Missions affairs and men are peculiarly circumstanced, and since not a few difficulties could arise, if the rule in question were to permit of no exception whatever; our Most Holy Father, the Pope, has in his goodness deigned to decree that faculties be granted to Ordinaries of Missions, as by the present letter they are granted to the same, to permit that priests subject to them may, for a just and reasonable cause, receive a stipend for a second Mass to be celebrated on the same day.'<sup>1</sup>

From the statement in Statute 111 of the Maynooth Synod, there is no doubt that the faculties here granted to 'Ordinaries of Missions'—*Ordinariis Missionum*—were extended to the Irish Bishops. Do they still continue?

The fact that Ireland ceased to be a missionary country after the publication of the Constitution *Sapienti Consilio*, in the year 1908, may, perhaps, incline one to a negative answer. The conclusion, however, would not be justified. There was nothing whatever in the change then effected about the withdrawal of faculties already granted; and, as a matter of fact, our Bishops continued to use, long after the new regulations had come into force, faculties, if not in this, certainly in other departments, which they had received from the Propaganda prior to 1908. Neither have these powers been withdrawn by the Code; in fact, Canon 4 expressly confirms concessions of this kind. Nor have they been affected by the decree *Proxima* of the Consistorial Congregation published in the *Acta Ap. Sedis* of May, 1918. This decree, indeed, withdrew 'all faculties which were granted to Ordinaries for the external forum, and which are contained in Formulae and Briefs'; but it expressly declared that faculties not contained in these Formulae and Briefs, which were granted to Ordinaries for special seasons, did not come within its scope and consequently were not abolished.<sup>2</sup> The Consistorial Congregation, too,

<sup>1</sup> Coll. S. C. de Prop. Fide, n. 887: 'Cum tamen specilia sint in nonnullis Missionibus rerum ac personarum adjuncta, cumque difficultates non paucæ oriri possent si regula de qua agitur nullam omnino exceptionem pateretur; SSmus. D. N. Papa benigne decernere dignatus est, ut Ordinariis Missionum facultas impertiatur, quemadmodum per praesentes litteras eisdem tribuitur, indulgendi ut, justa et gravi causa intercedente, sacerdotes sibi subditi etiam pro secunda Missa in eadem die celebranda stipendium percipere possint ac valeant.'

<sup>2</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, vol. x p. 191: '3) Facultates pro foro interno a S. Poenitentiarum datae, aliaque ratione praesentis belli concessae, aut peculiaribus de causis ab Ordinariis obtentae, sub hujus decreti dispositione non comprehenduntur, et ideo abolitae non sunt.'

in reply to a query, stated in the *Acta Ap. Sedis* of July, 1918, that this decree did not embrace certain faculties which bear a very close resemblance to those in question.<sup>1</sup>

Hence in our opinion the concession referred to in Statute 111 of the Maynooth Synod still remains. There are one or two points in connexion with it, however, to which we should like to call attention. Our correspondent seems to be under the impression that the privilege of receiving a stipend for a second Mass was directly conferred on the priests of this country at the request, indeed, of the Bishops, so that, whenever a just and reasonable cause existed, a priest who celebrated a second Mass on the same day could accept a stipend for it without having obtained any permission from the Bishops. It must be confessed that the words of the statute in question lend considerable colour to this view. If the statute, however, be interpreted—as it must be interpreted—in the light of the Encyclical Letter of the Propaganda to which we have referred, it will at once be evident that the concession has been directly granted to the Bishops, and that it empowers them to permit their priests to receive a stipend of this kind. Accordingly, without the permission of their Bishops priests are not justified in utilizing this privilege.

Another point of importance is that the Bishops can grant permission to accept the stipend only for a just and reasonable cause. Now, if the celebrant himself is to retain the stipend, practically the only reasonable cause that can be conceived, or that *de facto* is taken into consideration by writers on this matter, is poverty. Consequently, when priests are able to maintain themselves decently out of their other revenues this privilege can scarcely ever be availed of.

2. By an extrinsic title is understood some labour, expense, or inconvenience not intrinsically connected with the celebration of Mass—the three-miles' drive mentioned by our correspondent is quite an admirable example of it. Now the Code, in conformity with the pre-existing discipline, expressly states that it is always lawful to receive compensation for such labour, expense, or inconvenience, even in the case of a second Mass, for the application of which it is not permissible to accept a stipend.<sup>2</sup> From what has been said, it would appear that our correspondent's notice of extrinsic title is somewhat confused. An extrinsic title justifies a priest in accepting payment for the labour, expense, or inconvenience which it connotes, it has nothing whatever to do with the acceptance of a stipend for the application of a Mass. Hence, for

<sup>1</sup>l.c. p. 325: 'Quaesitum est a nonnullis Episcopis utrum decretum S.C. Consistorialis diei 25 Aprilis hujus anni. . . comprehenderet etiam indulta quaedam circa Missas in favorem Seminarii applicandas nonnullis dioecesibus concessa.'

'Huic dubio, de mandato SSmi. D.N., S. Congregatio respondit: memorata indulta non fuisse comprehensa, ideoque in suo robore manere.'

<sup>2</sup>Canon 824, § 2. Cf. Gasparri, *De S. Eucharistia*, vol. i. n. 399: 'At si pro alterius Missae celebratione sacerdos habet aliquas expensas, e.g., pro curru aut pro equo, posse harum expensarum restitutionem exigere, evidens est. Pariter pro labore et incommodo non quidem interinseco celebrationi, sed extrinseco et accidentali, potest aliquam remunerationem accipere.'



example, a priest who binates and who discharges an obligation of justice in the first Mass, cannot accept a stipend for the application of the second Mass, even though a long drive is involved. On the other hand, in similar circumstances, a priest who, for example, takes the place of a fellow-priest, could accept payment from the latter for the expense and inconvenience which such a drive would involve.

### COMPETENCY BY REASON OF CONTRACT IN MATRIMONIAL CASES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly discuss in the pages of the *I. E. RECORD*, whether the Bishop of the place in which a marriage is contracted is competent to deal judicially with questions which may afterwards arise in connexion with the marriage, even though the parties have no domicile or quasi-domicile in his diocese. If I mistake not, there were formerly some doubts on this point. Have they been removed by the Code?

INQUIRER.

Our correspondent is quite correct in his assumption that it was much disputed amongst canonists whether a Bishop became competent to deal with matrimonial cases by reason of the fact that the contract was entered into in his diocese. About the general principle, that the ecclesiastical superiors were competent to deal with contracts made in their territories, no doubt existed; the Decretals expressly stated this and canonists universally admitted it.<sup>1</sup> Very many writers urged that, as no exception had been made, this principle should be applied to matrimonial contracts too. This was really the fundamental reason for the positive view, and a very convincing reason it was. In addition, Boudinhon, in the *Canoniste Contemporain* of November, 1903, related that two Bishops consulted the Sacred Congregation of the Council on this matter, and that in each case the reply was: '*Episcopus utatur jure suo.*'<sup>2</sup> This plainly indicated that the Congregation considered that the general principle regarding contract as a means of determining competency was applicable to matrimonial cases.

The reasons for the opposite view were derived mainly from the various documents on matrimonial processes issued by the Roman Curia during the last century. In none of these was there any mention of the forum of contract, whilst not a few expressly record the competency of the forum of domicile. Thus, the Austrian Instruction declared that matrimonial cases were subject to the Bishop in whose diocese the husband had a domicile,<sup>3</sup> and the Instruction of the Propaganda issued in

<sup>1</sup> L. ii. t. 2, x: '*Licet ratione delicti, seu contractus aut domicilii sive rei . . . quibus forum regulariter quis sortit.*'

<sup>2</sup> 'Je puis citer deux cas recents a ma connaissance, dans lesquels la demande de nullite ayant été présentée à l'Évêque du contrat . . . la S. C. a répondu: *Episcopus utatur jure suo.*'

<sup>3</sup> § 96: '*Conjuges in causis matrimonialibus subsunt episcopo in cujus dioecesi maritus domicilium habet.*'

1888 contained a similar statement.<sup>1</sup> In 1893 the Archbishop of Cologne expressly asked the Holy Office, 'Whether in all matrimonial cases in which there was question of the validity of marriage, besides the forum of the domicile of the husband, the forum of contract and the forum of connexion or inclusion should be also deemed sufficient.' The answer was that the Instruction of the Propaganda issued in 1888, and the reply of the Holy Office given in 1881, should be adhered to.<sup>2</sup> Now in both the Instruction and reply the forum of domicile alone is mentioned, no account whatsoever being taken of the forum of contract. This formed a very strong argument, certainly, for the view which we are considering; but, as the Congregation did not expressly deny the competency of the forum of contract, it could scarcely be regarded as conclusive. As a matter of fact the best modern authorities regarded the point as really doubtful. This is the conclusion which Gasparri arrived at after a very exhaustive examination of the question.<sup>3</sup> Lega in his fourth volume on ecclesiastical trials seemed to accept Gasparri's view,<sup>4</sup> though in the first volume he held it as certain that contract was a means of determining competency in matrimonial cases.<sup>5</sup> Wernz, too, though he favoured this latter opinion, did not by any means adopt it unreservedly.<sup>6</sup>

The Code has now definitely settled these doubts. Canon 1964 expressly applies to matrimonial cases the general principle, stated in Canon 1564, that a person may be convened before the Ordinary of the place in which a contract is made in all matters which have reference to the contract. Of course, as the Code itself points out, the principle is applicable only to cases that may be tried in the first instance before the local Ordinary, it has nothing whatever to do with those reserved to the Holy See in accordance with Canons 1962 and 1963. That contract might be a means of determining competence, canonists in pre-Code days required two conditions: the defendant should be present in the place of contract at the time the citation was issued, and, secondly, he should have spent some time there at the time the contract was entered into, though it was by no means deemed necessary that he should have acquired a domicile or quasi-domicile. Pirhing in conformity with the general teaching explained this latter requirement thus:—

In loco ubi contraxit et incola non est, morum trahit, vel negotium ibi tractare coeperit, vel tabernam. officinam, pergulam, seu tentorium aut horreum conduxerit ad vendendum, ibique distraxit, vel emit, sicut mercatores ad nundinas venientes facere solent . . . ; secus est de viatore seu peregrino, qui si in loco alieno per quem transit aut in quo non diu moraturus est, contrahat non potest ratione talis contractus ibi conveniri.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Conjuges in causis matrimonialibus subsunt episcopo in cujus dioecesi maritus domicilium habet.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Standum instructioni pro Statu Foederatis Americae an. 1883 editae . . . ac responsioni an 1<sup>um</sup> in decreto S. Officii lato die 30 Julii 1892.'

<sup>3</sup> *De Matr.*, vol. ii. n. 1464.

<sup>4</sup> *De Judiciis Eccl.*, vol. iv. p. 472.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* vol. i., 'neque excludendae videntur causae matrimoniales.'

<sup>6</sup> *Jus Decret.* tom. iv. n. 736, nota 42: 'Utrum Episcopus sit competens ex sola ratione contractus matrimonialis, qui in ipsius dioecesi fuerat celebratus minore certitudine constat.'

<sup>7</sup> *Lib. ii. t. 2. n. 36.*



Now, it is a general principle, embodied in Canon 6, that the new legislation, in so far as it is in agreement with the old, must be explained in accordance with the received interpretations of the latter: we are of opinion, therefore, that these conditions are still necessary. Another argument for requiring the first condition may be deduced from Canon 1566, § 2, which states that the judge of the place where a crime has been committed has the right of citing the criminal to appear before him and of passing sentence on him, even though he has left the place prior to the citation. The Code has here expressly changed the old teaching; we are, therefore, justified in concluding that if there were a similar change in connexion with the forum of contract, it also would have been expressly made.

J. KINANE.

## LITURGY

### SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING THE NUPTIAL MASS AND BLESSING

REV. DEAR SIR,—I would be obliged for answers to the following queries in next issue of the I. E. RECORD:—

I. In a diocese in which it is ordered by the Bishop that there be a Nuptial Mass on the occasion of every marriage and a number of priests assist at a particular marriage, may one of the priests marry the party, and another say the Mass and give the Nuptial blessing?

II. If the celebrant forgets the Nuptial blessing which should be given immediately after the *Pater Noster* until he has gone past the *Pater Noster*, may he give it later in the Mass, before his own Communion or after it, or when Mass is over?

III. Suppose the case where a priest has to marry two or three parties on the same morning; may he give the Nuptial blessing to all of them *in globo* or should it be given to each party separately?

IV. To give the Nuptial blessing, is it necessary that the Votive Mass *pro sponsis* should be said or may it be given in the Mass of the day?

QUAESITOR.

I. Yes; provided the celebrant of the Nuptial Mass has the consent of the parish priest or of the Ordinary.<sup>1</sup> A decree<sup>2</sup> of the Holy Office (dated September 1, 1841) states: '*Licite matrimonium contractum coram parochio benedici ab alio sacerdote de consensu parochi vel Ordinarii.*' De Amicis gives the reason: '*Benedictio nuptiarum a celebrante dari potest qui matrimonium non benedixit. Quia duo sunt ita prorsus distincta ut nihil obstet, quominus alter consensum audiat, superpelliceo tamen et stola indutus, alter missam postea faciat, modo jure id possit, et benedictionem impertiat.*'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It should be carefully noted that the priest who celebrates the Mass should also give the blessing.

<sup>2</sup> S.C.S. Offic., n. 1554, Can. 462, § 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ceremoniale Parochorum*, tom. ii. p. 331.

II. There are several decrees indicating that the Nuptial blessing should take place during the Mass in accordance with the rubrics. For instance, the following decree<sup>1</sup> of the Holy Office: 'Benedictionem nuptialem quam exhibit Missale Romanum in *Missa pro sponso et sponsa* semper impertiendam esse in matrimonii catholicorum, infra tamen Missae celebrationem iuxta rubricas'; and to the query,<sup>2</sup> 'Haec eadem benedictio Nuptialis potestne separari a Missa ita ut extra hanc impertiri possit?' the Congregation of Rites replied, 'Negative.' It is clear, therefore, that from whatever cause the Nuptial blessing has been omitted during the Mass it may not take place when the Mass is over. As to whether the Prayers of the blessing, if forgotten before the *Libera Nos*, etc.—which is the proper place for their insertion—may be added subsequently in the Mass, the same rules, we think, should apply as are usually given in cases of omission of non-essential portions of the Mass, e.g., the *Credo* and the *Gloria*. If the Prayers are remembered very soon after the the rubrically appointed time, then we think they may be said, as in themselves they have nothing definitely linking them with this portion of the Mass. It may be well, however, to remind our correspondent that the Nuptial blessing does not consist<sup>3</sup> merely of the Prayers before the *Libera Nos*; there is also the Prayer '*Deus Abraham*,' etc., which is prescribed to be said immediately before the ordinary blessing of the Mass. The Nuptial blessing is not complete until this Prayer '*Deus Abraham*' has been recited, and perhaps we might see therein a reason of propriety why the former Prayers, omitted inadvertently up to that point, might then be added in completion of the rite.

III. The Nuptial blessing should be given *in globo* to the several parties and no change should be made in the form of the prescribed Prayers. The decree of the Holy Office already quoted says: 'In eadem Missa posse sacerdotem plures sponso benedicere,' and the *Ceremoniale Parochorum* comments: 'Semel tantum praescriptas orationes recitando sine ulla variatione, sed prout in Missali jacent.'

IV. If the solemn Nuptial blessing is to be given then the Votive Mass *pro sponso et sponsa* is obligatory whenever the rubrics permit it. This is clear from the direction of the Ritual—'si benedicendae sint nuptiae . . . parochus Missam pro sponso et sponsa celebret'—and from the rubrics of the Missal ('Ante Missam pro sponsis'). The following reply<sup>4</sup> of the Congregation of Rites also confirms this: 'Missa in Nuptiis semper debet esse votiva pro sponso et sponsa ut in Missali praeterquam in Festis de praecepto et Duplicibus primae et secundae classis; in quibus Missae occurrenti addenda est commemoratio pro sponso et sponsa. In ea vero, assignata benedictio, juxta Rubricas, non est impertienda nisi in Missa.'

If the rubrics do not permit the celebration of the Nuptial Mass, then,

<sup>1</sup> S.C.S.O., n. 1560.

<sup>2</sup> Decr. 3798 ad 4. The new Code (can. 1101) says: 'Sed solum in Missa, servata speciali rubrica et excepto tempore feriato.'

<sup>3</sup> Decr. 3798 ad 3.

<sup>4</sup> Decr. 3798.



with the exception of the *tempus clausum*, during which both the Nuptial Mass and the solemn blessing are alike prohibited, the blessing may be given in a Mass *de festo* or *de tempore* provided a commemoration is made of the Mass *pro sponso et sponsa*. In the new Code (can. 1108, § 2) the *tempus clausum* is 'a prima dominica Adventus usque ad diem Nativitatis Domini inclusive, et a feria iv Cinerum usque ad dominicam Paschatis inclusive.' It is well to note, however, that according to Canon 1108, § 3, the Ordinary may, *for a just cause*, allow the Nuptial blessing even during this time—'salvis legibus liturgicis,'—and a subsequent decree<sup>1</sup> of the Congregation of Rites states that when such permission has been obtained the Nuptial Mass may also be said—'exceptis tamen Dominicis, Festis de praecepto etiam I et II classis, Octavis privilegiatis I. et II. ordinis, Feriis privilegiatis et vigilia Nativitatis Domini.'

Outside the *tempus clausum* the Nuptial Mass may be said on all days—except (1) Sundays and Holidays (even suppressed); (2) on Doubles of the 1st and 2nd Class; (3) on days excluding Doubles of the 1st and 2nd Class, e.g. the Vigil of Pentecost, during the Octaves of Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi; (4) in churches where there is only one conventual Mass; (5) on Rogation days where the procession takes place and only one Mass is said; (6) on All Souls Day (when the Mass, the blessing and commemoration are prohibited). On these forbidden days the *Mass of the day* is said with a commemoration *pro sponso et sponsa* and the Nuptial blessing imparted according to the prescribed form given in the Votive Mass *pro sponsis*.

A few additional points of interest in connexion with the Nuptial Mass and blessing may here be noted:—

(a) The Mass is considered a *Missa Votiva privata*, and hence whether read or sung there is neither *Gloria* nor *Credo*.

(b) There are three Prayers arranged as follows: (1st) of the Mass itself; (2nd) of the day; (3rd) *de tempore*, if there is no special commemoration. When a Double is commemorated there are only two Prayers, unless there are special commemorations prescribed for the day.

(c) If permission has been granted for the Nuptial blessing on the excepted days, the commemoration *pro sponsis* comes after the Prayers prescribed by the rubrics. According to the old legislation, as generally interpreted, the commemoration *pro sponsis* should never be joined to the first Prayer *sub una conclusione* even on Feasts of 1st class which exclude a special commemoration, but the recent decree<sup>2</sup> of the Sacred Congregation already quoted would seem to have effected a radical change in the matter. It was asked, 'Si Ordinarii ex hac licentia (sc. benedictionem nuptialem permittendi), quae non limitata esse videtur, benedictionem nuptialem permittant in Nativitate Domini et Dominica Resurrectionis, licetne Orationi Missae de respectivo Festo addere commemorationem pro sponsis, quamquam haec Festa, sicut alia Festa Epiphaniae, Pentecostes, SS<sup>mae</sup> Trinitatis et Corporis Christi, ullam aliam

<sup>1</sup> Decr. S.C.R., June 14, 1918.

<sup>2</sup> S.C.R., June 14, 1918.

orationem excludant?; and the reply was, 'Affirmative, sub unica conclusione.' Whatever, therefore, may have been the correct rubrical teaching in the past, it is clear that the commemoration *pro sponsis* is to be joined *sub una conclusione* with the Prayer of the Mass of the day on all the Feasts mentioned in this decree. The same, we think, should hold for all Doubles of the 1st Class, and even of the 2nd Class—when there is no special commemoration. On the other excepted days the old rule still holds, viz., that the commemoration *pro sponsis* is inserted 'immediate post ceteras orationes de rubrica sub distincta conclusione.'

(d) A priest is *not obliged to apply* the Nuptial Mass for a bridal couple if he receives no stipend for it. 'Ratio patet, ait <sup>1</sup> Stella, quia applicatio haud ejusdem juris est ac Missa: lex autem ad hanc obligans illam relinquit arbitrio parochi' (*Inst. Liturg.*).

### FEAST OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

Among the Roman documents published in this number (p. 68 *infra*) is a Letter from the Sacred Consistorial Congregation to His Eminence Cardinal Logue granting that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary (December 8) be henceforth a Holiday of obligation throughout the whole of Ireland. As the Letter itself indicates, it is written in reply to a request from His Eminence and the Irish Episcopate speaking on behalf of the Irish Church. In Canon 1247, § 1, of the new Code the Feast of the Immaculate Conception is mentioned as one of the Holidays of obligation to be observed throughout the whole Church, but a subsequent section of the same canon has the following clause: 'If in any place any of the Feasts mentioned have been abolished . . . no innovation is to be introduced without consultation with the Holy See' (can. 1247, § 3). The Feast of the Immaculate Conception has been kept in Ireland from a very early date. In fact, according to eminent authorities,<sup>2</sup> the first evidences of the celebration of a feast in honour of the Immaculate Conception in the Western Church are found in some Irish MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries.<sup>3</sup> We have also evidence that as early as the middle of the fourteenth century the precept of hearing Mass and abstaining from servile works on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was enjoined in at least a portion of the Irish Church. A decree<sup>4</sup> of the Provincial Synod of Dublin, A.D. 1351, begins:—

The Star of the world, Mary the Mother of our Redeemer, who by the glorious brightness of her sublime sanctity illumines the universe, is to be honoured by every Christian above all the saints of God; and though we on earth cannot pay her all the veneration that is her due, never-

<sup>1</sup> Vid. *Cerem. Parochorum*, tom. i. p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> See Father Thurston, *Month*, 1904, p. 449; Battifol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, p. 135; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 'Immaculate Conception'; I. E. RECORD, Fourth Series, vol. xvi. p. 502.

<sup>3</sup> In the MSS. the Feast is assigned by these early Irish calendars to 2nd or 3rd of May, owing probably, says Fr. Thurston, to the influence of a Coptic tradition.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Father Reginald Walsh, I. E. RECORD, Fourth Series, vol. xvi. p. 505.



theless it is fitting that we should celebrate in every way that is possible to us the praises of her who continually intercedes for us with her Son in heaven. We therefore enjoin that the Feast of the Conception of the glorious Virgin Mary be celebrated as a double in this Province (Dublin, Kildare, Leighlin, Ossory, and Ferns) for ever, and we enjoin on our subjects of this Province that *they hear Mass and attend devotions* in their parish churches, that with all their hearts they pray to God and to the said glorious Virgin for the remission of their sins, and that *they abstain from all servile works* on this Feast as they do on that of her Nativity—with, however, the substitution of the word 'Conception' for 'Nativity.'

Again, the Provincial Synod of Dublin, convened by Archbishop Russell in 1685, decreed<sup>1</sup>: 'De B.M.V. quae censetur totius regni patrona generalis, statuimus et mandamus ut festum *Immaculatae ejus Conceptionis* servetur ex praecepto in tota hac provincia ac proinde ut omnes ab operibus servilibus eo die abstineant' (*Statuta Dublin.*, p. 88). So that prior to the general decree (December 6, 1708) of Clement XI, making the Feast of the Immaculate Conception a Holiday of obligation throughout the entire Church, it was observed *sub duplici praecepto* in Ireland.

By a decree,<sup>2</sup> however, of Pius VI in 1778, granted at the request of the Irish Bishops, the obligation of hearing Mass and abstaining from servile works on this Feast as well as on several other Feast-days was abolished for the whole of Ireland. Though the old usage continued to prevail for a considerable time afterwards<sup>3</sup> in parts of the South and West, this decree fixed the discipline of the Irish Church for the past century and hence the necessity of the recent representations to the Holy See (in accordance with Canon 1247, § 3), when the Irish Episcopate decided, after the promulgation of the Code, to have the Feast restored as a Holiday of obligation throughout the whole of Ireland.

The reply of the Holy Father 'benignly granting the request' will be hailed with joy and gratitude by the Catholic people of Ireland, who, as history testifies, have ever been conspicuous for their devotion and love for the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and the faithful observance of this new Holiday in her honour will be an additional evidence of their love and veneration and will doubtless establish a further claim on her all-powerful guidance and intercession. 'For,' in the words of the decree, 'whatever tends to foster and increase devotion to the Blessed Virgin, that also will help to conciliate the protection of her who is the safeguard, the peace, and salvation of the Christian faithful. . . : Let the Bishops, however, take care to warn their people of this obligation, who, through the devotion they cherish towards the Mother of God, will surely observe this new Feast of precept devoutly and faithfully.'

M. EATON.

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Renehan, *Collections on Irish Church History*, p. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 318.

<sup>3</sup> In the diocese of Kerry it was finally abolished only in 1826 by another decree of the Holy See, and in the diocese of Elphin, 'because,' says Dr. French, in a letter of 1803, 'the diocese was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin,' the old usage prevailed until a very recent date (see Renehan, p. 319).

# DOCUMENTS

## LETTER FROM THE HOLY SEE TO HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL LOGUE GRANTING THAT THE FEAST OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION BE HENCEFORTH A HOLIDAY OF OBLIGATION FOR ALL IRELAND

(June 9, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

ROMAE, die 9 Junii, 1920.

EMĒ AC RĒE DÑE MI OBSĒE,

Quae E. V. Rm̃a, una cum Episcopatu Hiberniae, vota supplicationesque Apostolicae Sedi porrexit ut festum Immaculae Conceptionis tamquam de praecepto in tota Hibernia posthac haberetur, SS̃mus Dñus nedum benevolentissimo accepit animo, sed etiam perquam libenter probavit suoque apostolico beneplacito communivit.

Quidquid sane ad alendum augendumque cultum erga B. Virginem vertit, idipsum efficaciter confert ad ejusdem conciliandam protectionem, quae et praesidium est, et pax, et salus christianae plebis. Curae autem Episcoporum erit de hac obligatione populum praemonere, qui pro sua qua fervet erga Deiparam pietate procul dubio novum festum de praecepto devote fideliterque erit observaturus.

Hanc nactus occasionem gaudeo E. V. meam venerationem iterum testificari et in osculo manuum me profiteri.

Eminentiae V. R.,

humillū obsequū servum,

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Epūs Sabinen.,  
*Secret.*

Em̃o ac Rm̃o Dño,

D. MICHAELI CARD. LOGUE,  
Archiep. Armacano.



# ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF BENEDICT XV ON PEACE AND CHRISTIAN RECONCILIATION

(May 23. 1920)

## EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA

AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHIEPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS ALIOSQUE  
LOCORUM ORDINARIOS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA  
SEDE HABENTES: DE PACIS RECONCILIATIONE CHRISTIANA.

## BENEDICTUS PP. XV

VENERABILES FRATRES

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

Pacem, Dei munus pulcherrimum, 'quo, ut Augustinus ait, etiam in rebus terrenis atque mortalibus nihil gratius soleat audiri, nihil desiderabilius concupisci, nihil postremo possit melius inveniri'<sup>1</sup>; pacem quadriennio amplius tantis et bonorum votis et piorum precibus et matrum lacrimis imploratam, tandem coepisse affulgere populis Nos equidem ante omnes gaudemus vehementerque laetamur. At vero hanc ipsam paterno conceptam animo lætitiā nimis multa eademque acerbissima perturbant; nam si fere ubique bellum aliqua ratione compositum est, et pacis quaedam conventiones subscriptae, reliqua sunt tamen antiquarum semina inimicitiarum; vosque probe tenetis, Venerabiles Fratres, nullam pacem consistere, nulla pacis foedera posse vigere, quamvis diutinis laboriosisque consultationibus constituta sanctaeque firmata, nisi per caritatis mutuae reconciliationem odia simul inimicitiaeque conquiescant. De hac re igitur, quae maximi sane momenti est ad commune bonum, vobiscum, Venerabiles Fratres, colloqui placet ac populos item vestros diligentius commonere.

Nos enimvero, ex quo ad huius Cathedrae dignitatem arcano Dei consilio evecti sumus, numquam, dum bellum conflagravit, cessavimus, quacumque potuimus ope, contendere, ut quamprimum omnes orbis terrarum populi fraternam inter se officiorum vicissitudinem repeterent. Itaque instare precibus, hortationes iterare, amicitiae reconciliandae vias proponere, denique omnia tentare, si liceret, favente Deo, ad pacem, quae iusta quidem et honesta futura esset et stabilis, hominibus aditum ianuamque patefacere; interea studiosam paterno pectore dare operam, ut maximis omne genus doloribus et aerumnis, quae immanem dimicationem consequebantur, aliquid usque quaque levationis afferremus. Iam vero quae Nos ab initio tam difficili Nostri Pontificatus impulit Iesu Christi caritas vel ad elaborandum pro pacis reditu, vel ad horrores belli mitigandos, eadem hodie, cum pax aliqua tandem aliquando convenit, urget nos ut omnes Ecclesiae filios atque adeo hominum universitatem hortemur, velint diuturniora iam odia abiicere ex animis, concordiamque suscipere mutuūque amorem.

Nec sane est cur multis demonstremus generis humani societatem maximis affectum iri detrimentis si, pace conventa, obscurae tamen

<sup>1</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xix. c. xi.

gentium inter gentes inimicitiae simultatesque perseverarent. Mittimus damna earum rerum omnium, quibus civilis vitae progressio alitur et promovetur, ut mercaturis, ut opificiis, ut artibus, ut litteris, quae quidem communi populorum consuetudine ac tranquillitate vigent. At, quod maius est, gravissimum vulnus acceptura esset christianae vitae ratio ac forma, cuius vis omnis in caritate consistit, cum ipsa christianae legis praedicatio *Evangelium pacis* appelletur.<sup>1</sup>

Etenim, ut scitis et ut Nos pluribus alias commemoravimus, nihil tam saepe tamque vehementer a Iesu Domino inculcatum est discipulorum auribus, quam hoc de mutua caritate praeceptum, utpote quod cetera complecteretur omnia; idque et novum Christus ipse nominavit et suum, et christianorum tamquam insigne voluit esse, unde internosci ab aliis facile possent. Denique iam moriens id ipsum suis testatus est, rogavitque ut inter se diligerent ac diligendo eam ineffabilem unitatem imitari contenderent, quae divinis Personis est in Trinitate: 'Ut omnes unum sint . . . sicut et nos unum sumus . . . ut sint consummati in unum.'<sup>2</sup>

Ergo divini Magistri vestigia sectantes Apostoli, eiusque voce ac praeceptis probe conformati, mirificae sedulitatis erant ad fideles ita cohortandos: 'Ante omnia autem mutuam in vobismetipsis charitatem continuam habentes.'<sup>3</sup> 'Supra omnia autem haec charitatem habete, quod est vinculum perfectionis.'<sup>4</sup> 'Charissimi, diligamus nos invicem: quia charitas ex Deo est.'<sup>5</sup> Bene autem monitis obsequebantur et Christi et Apostolorum illi priscorum temporum fratres nostri: qui quidem, etsi alii ex aliis contrariisque inter se nationibus erant, tamen discordiarum memoriam voluntaria oblivione delentes, concordissime vivebant. Et vere cum mortalibus inimiciis, in societatis humanae sinu tum flagrantibus, mirandum in modum tanta mentium animorumque consensio discrepabat.

Iam quae modo allata sunt ad praeceptum mutui amoris urgendum, eadem ipsa valent ad oblivionem iniuriarum: nec minus affirmative id praecipit Dominus: 'Ego autem dico vobis: Diligite inimicos vestros: benefacite his qui oderunt vos: et orate pro persequentibus et calumniantibus vos: ut sitis filii Patris vestri qui in caelis est: qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos.'<sup>6</sup> Hinc illud gravissimum Ioannis Apostoli: 'Omnis qui odit fratrem suum, homicida est. Et scitis quoniam omnis homicida non habet vitam aeternam in semetipso manentem.'<sup>7</sup> Denique sic a Christo Domino instituti sumus ad Deum orandum, ut profiteamur ita nos nobis velle ignosci, si aliis ignoscamus: 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.'<sup>8</sup> Quod si huic obtemperare legi nimis aliquando est arduum et difficile, adest ad omnem submovendam difficultatem divinus humani generis Redemptor non solum opportuno suae gratiae auxilio, sed etiam suo ipsius exemplo, qui cum in cruce penderet, eos, a quibus tam iniuste indigneque torquebatur, Patri excusans: 'Pater, *inquit*, dimitte illis: non enim sciunt

<sup>1</sup> Eph. vi. 15.<sup>2</sup> Ioan. xvii. 21-23.<sup>3</sup> 1 Petr. iv. 8.<sup>4</sup> Coloss. iii. 14.<sup>5</sup> 1 Ioan. iv. 7.<sup>6</sup> Matt. v. 44, 45.<sup>7</sup> 1 Ioan. iii. 15.<sup>8</sup> Matt. vi. 12.



quid faciunt.<sup>1</sup> Nos igitur, cum misericordiam benignitatemque Iesu Christi, cuius, quamvis nullo merito, vicem gerimus, sequi ante omnes debeamus, ipsius exemplo, inimicis Nostris quicumque, scientes imprudentesve, personam operamve Nostram quibusvis contumeliarum aculeis vel lacerarunt vel lacerant, universis et singulis toto pectore veniam damus, omnesque summo studio ac benevolentia complectimur, nullum etiam praetermittentes locum eisdem benefactis pro Nostra facultate cumulandi. Quod ipsum christiani homines, qui hac sint appellatione digni, faciant oportet erga eos qui se, tenente bello, iniuriis affecerint.

Neque enim eo contenta est christiana caritas ut non inimicos oderimus atque ut eos fratrum loco diligamus, vult quoque ut benigne eisdem faciamus, vestigiis insistentes Redemptoris nostri, 'qui pertransiit benefaciendo et sanando omnes oppressos a diabolo,'<sup>2</sup> et mortalis vitae cursum, quem totum maximis in homines beneficiis emensus erat, profuso pro iisdem sanguine consummavit. Quare Ioannes : 'In hoc cognovimus charitatem Dei, quoniam ille animam suam pro nobis posuit : et nos debemus pro fratribus animam ponere. Qui habuerit substantiam huius mundi et viderit fratrem suum necessitatem habere et clausit viscera sua ab eo : Quomodo caritas Dei manet in eo ? Filioli mei, non diligamus verbo neque lingua, sed opere et veritate.'<sup>3</sup> Numquam vero amplius 'dilatanda spatia charitatis' visa sunt, quam hisce ipsis diebus, in summis nempe angustiis quibus premimur omnes ac laboramus : neque alias fortasse unquam hominum generi tam opus fuit, quam hodie communis beneficentia, quae a sincero aliorum amore nascatur plenaque sit devotionis et alacritatis. Etenim si circumspiciamus quacumque pervagatus est bellicus furor immensi terrarum tractus obiciuntur ubi solitudo et vastitas, ubi inculta et relictia omnia ; redactae usque eo plebes ut victu vestitu tectisque ipsis careant ; viduae orphanique innumerabiles, qui cuiuslibet opis indigent ; incredibilis multitudo debilium, infantium potissimum ac puerorum, in affectis corporibus testantium belli huius atrocitatem.

Has tantas miserias contemplanti quibus premitur humanum genus, sponte venit in mentem viator ille evangelicus,<sup>4</sup> qui, descendens ab Ierusalem in Iericho, incidit in latrones, a quibus despoliatus, plagisque impositis, est semivivus relictus. Magna enim est inter utrumque similitudo ; et quemadmodum ad illum, misericordia motus, Samaritanus accessit, qui, alligatis vulneribus, infusoque oleo et vino, duxit eum in stabulum, et curam eius egit : ita ad sananda humanae societatis vulnera manum suam adhibeat oportet Iesus Christus, cuius quidem Samaritanus ille personam sustinebat.

Iam hoc opus et munus tamquam proprium sibi Ecclesia vindicat, quae Iesu Christi spiritum custodit, ut haeres ; Ecclesia, inquam, cuius omnis vita mirabili beneficiorum varietate contextitur : ipsa enim 'mater christianorum verissima, proximi dilectionem atque charitatem ita complectitur ut variorum morborum, quibus pro peccatis suis animae

<sup>1</sup> Luc. xxiii. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Act. x. 38.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Ioan. iii. 16-18.

<sup>4</sup> Luc. x. 30 sqq.

aegrotant, omnis apud ipsam medicina praepolleat': unde 'pueriliter pueros, fortiter iuvenes, quiete senes, prout cuiusque non corporis tantum, sed et animi aetas est, exercet ac docet.'<sup>1</sup>—Haec autem christianae beneficentiae officia animos permulcendo, incredibile est quam sint tranquillitati publicae restituendae conducibilia.

Quare, Venerabiles Fratres, oramus et obsecramus in visceribus caritatis Christi, omni studio ac diligentia in hoc incumbite ut, quotquot habetis vestrae mandatos curae, eos non modo ad odia deponenda iniuriasque condonandas excitetis, sed efficacius etiam ad ea omnia christianae beneficentiae instituta provehenda impellatis, quae sint subsidio egenis, solatio maerentibus, munimento infirmis, denique omnibus qui bello maximas iacturas fecerint, opportunam varii generis opem afferant. Praecipue vero volumus sacerdotes hortemini, administri qui sunt christianae pacis, ut in hac re, quae vitam christianam maxime continet, assidui sint, id est in amore erga proximos vel inimicos commendando: atque 'omnibus omnia facti'<sup>2</sup> adeo ut ceteros antecedant exemplo, odio inimicitiaeque bellum indicant, acriterque gerant usque quaque, gratissimum facientes et amantissimo Iesu Cordi, et ei, qui vices ipsius in terris, quamvis non digne, sustinet. Quo loco admonendi sunt etiam vehementerque rogandi catholici homines, qui scribendis vel libris vel commentariis vel diariis dant operam, velint 'sicut electi Dei, sancti et dilecti, viscera misericordiae, benignitatem'<sup>3</sup> induere, eamque scribendo exprimere, non modo a falsis vanisque criminationibus abstinentes, sed etiam ab omni violentia contumeliaque verborum, quae quidem cum christianae legi contraria est, tum male obductas refricare cicatrices dumtaxat potest, cum praesertim recens a vulnere animus sit vel levissimi attactus iniuriarum impatientior.

Quae vero hic de colendae caritatis officio singulos admonemus, eadem ad populos diutina belli contentione perfunctos volumus pertinere, ut, amotis, quantum fieri potest, dissidiorum causis,—et salvis utique iustitiae rationibus—amicitiam inter se et coniunctionem redintegrent. Nec enim alia est evangelica lex caritatis in singulis hominibus, alia in ipsis civitatibus et populis, qui demum omnes e singulis hominibus conflantur et constant. Exacto autem bello, non ratione tantum caritatis, sed quadam etiam necessitate in universalem quandam populorum inter populos conciliationem inclinare res videntur, cum gentes naturali vinculo mutuae et indigentiae simul et benevolentiae inter se nunc maxime copulentur, hoc exquisitiore humanitatis cultu et commerciorum aucta mirum in modum facilitate.

Hanc igitur oblivionem offensionum fraternamque populorum reconciliationem quam Christi Iesu lex sanctissima iubet ac rationes ipsae humani civilisque convictus flagitant, haec Apostolica Sedes, cum, saeviente bello, ut supra docimus, nunquam urgere praetermiserit, nec passa sit unquam quibusvis simultatibus odiisve obliterari, multo nunc magis, pacis constitutis foederibus, fovet ac praedicat, ut litteris datis

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Augustine, *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae*, lib. 1, c. xxx.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Coloss. iii. 12.



haud ita pridem ad omnes Germaniae episcopos,<sup>1</sup> alterisque ad Cardinalem Archiepiscopum Parisiensem.<sup>2</sup> Quoniam vero hanc exultarum gentium concordiam tuetur multumque promovet ea, quae hodie increbruit, consuetudo ut ad maiora negotia expedienda inter se visitent convenientque civitatum gubernatores ac principes, Nos, omnia reputantes et mutata rerum adiuncta et magnas communium temporum inclinationes, eiusdem concordiae adjuvandae causa, ne ab eo quidem—consilio alieni essemus aliquid remittendi de illarum severitate conditionum, quas, ob eversum Apostolicae Sedis civilem principatum, iure Decessores Nostri statuerunt, ut catholicorum principum solemniores ad Urbem adventus cohiberent. Apertissime autem profitemur hanc Nostrae rationis indulgentiam, quam humanae societatis gravissima praeter modum tempora suadere atque adeo postulare videntur, nequaquam interpretandam esse tanquam Apostolicae Sedis abdicationem tacitam iurium sanctissimorum, quasi in praesenti, quo utitur, abnormi statu ea tandem acquieverit. Quin potius hanc ipsam Nos occasionem nacti 'quas Decessores Nostri pluries expostulationes fecerunt, non quidem humanis rationibus, sed officii sanctitate adducti, ut videlicet iura ac dignitatem Apostolicae Sedis defenderent, easdem Nos iisdem de causis hic renovamus,' denuo graviusque postulantes ut, pace inter gentes composita, etiam 'Ecclesiae Caput in hac desinat absona conditione versari, quae ipsi tranquillitati populorum, non uno nomine, vehementer nocet.'<sup>3</sup>

Ita igitur restitutis rebus, iustitiae et caritatis ordine revocato, reconciliatisque inter se populis, optandum sane est, Venerabiles Fratres, cunctas civitates, quavis ultro citroque suspicione remota, in unam tamquam consociationem seu potius quandam quasi familiam coalescere cum ad propriam uniuscuiusque libertatem tuendam, tum ad ordinem conservandum humanae societatis. Ad quam gentium consociationem contrahendam hortatur, ut alia multa praetereamus, ipsa vulgo explorata necessitas omnem dandi operam ut, sublati vel imminuti rei militaris sumptibus, quorum immane pondus iam sustinere republicae non possunt, nulla posthac existant tam exitiosa bella, vel certe quam longissime eiusmodi periculum avertatur, et unicuique populo, cum libera potestate, sua territorii, iustis quidem terminati finibus, integritas conservetur.

Foederatis autem christiana lege nationibus, quicquid iustitiae et caritatis causa susceperint, non studium operamque suam desiderari sinet Ecclesia, quae cum absolutissimum sit societatis universalis exemplar, tum ex sua ipsius temperatione suisque institutis mirifica virtute pollet ad homines copulandos non modo in aeternam eorum salutem, sed etiam in huius vitae commoditatem, sic eos nempe deducens per bona temporalia ut non amittant aeterna. Itaque, historia teste, cognovimus, veteres Europae gentes immanitate barbaras, ex quo in easdem Ecclesiae spiritus penetraverit, extenuato sensim ipsarum inter

<sup>1</sup> Litterae Apostolicae, *Diurni*, die xv Iulii mcmxix.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. *Amor ille singularis*, die vii Octobris mcmxix.

<sup>3</sup> Litterae Encyclicae *Ad beatissime*, datae die 1 Novembris mcmxiv.

ipsas multiplices maximoque discrimine sublatisque discordiis, coivisse tandem in unam eiusdem generis societatem, natamque esse Europam christianam, quae, ductu auspicioque Ecclesiae, nationum varietatem retinens, tamen ad unitatem quamdam prosperitatis fautricem gloriaeque niteretur. Praeclare ad rem ita Augustinus: 'Haec caelestis civitas dum peregrinatur in terra, ex omnibus gentibus cives evocat atque in omnibus linguis peregrinam colligit societatem, non curans quidquid in moribus, legibus institutisque diversum est, quibus pax terrena vel conquiritur vel tenetur, nihil eorum rescindens vel destruens, immo etiam servans ac sequens, quod licet diversum sit in diversis nationibus, ad unum tamen eundemque finem terrenae pacis intenditur, si religionem qua, unus summus et verus Deus colendus docetur, non impedit.'<sup>1</sup> Sic igitur idem sanctus Doctor Ecclesiam alloquitur: 'Tu cives civibus, gentes gentibus et prorsus homines, primorum parentum recordatione, non societate solum, sed quadam etiam fraternitate coniungis.'<sup>2</sup>

Quare Nos, ut eo redeamus unde initium scribendi fecimus, primum filios Nostros, quotquot sunt, amplectentes, in nomine Domini Nostri Iesu Christi rogamus iterum et obsecramus inducant animum mutuas similitudines offensionesque omnes voluntaria oblivione conterere, et christianae caritatis, cui nemo extraneus est aut alienus, sanctissimo inter se cohaerere vinculo; tum nationes universas magnopere hortamur, ut veram inter se pacem christianae benevolentiae spiritu componere velint coeuntes in unum foedus, auspice iustitia, mansurum; denique cunctos homines populosque appellamus, ut mentibus et animis Ecclesiae Catholicae, et per Ecclesiam Christo humani generis Redemptori sese adiungant: atque ita quibus verbis Paulus Ephesios, iisdem Nos alloqui omnes verissime possimus: 'Nunc autem in Christo Iesu vos, qui aliquando eratis longe, facti estis prope in sanguine Christi. Ipse enim est pax nostra, qui fecit utraque unum, et medium parietem maceriae solvens . . . interficiens inimicitias in semetipso. Et veniens evangelizavit pacem vobis, qui longe fuistis, et pacem iis qui prope.'<sup>3</sup> Nec minus apte cadunt quae idem Apostolus habet ad Colossenses: 'Nolite mentiri invicem, expoliantes vos veterem hominem cum actibus suis, et induentes novum, eum qui renovatur in agnitionem, secundum imaginem eius, qui creavit illum: ubi non est Gentilis et Iudaeus, circumcisio et praeputium, Barbarus et Scythia, servus et liber: sed omnia, et in omnibus Christus.'<sup>4</sup>

Interea Spiritum Sanctum Paraclitum,—patrocinio confisi Mariae Virginis Immaculatae, quam *Reginae pacis* titulo ab omnibus invocari nuper iussimus, itemque trium beatorum caelorum quibus sanctorum honores proxime decrevimus—humilibus precibus exoramus, ut 'Ecclesiae suae unitatis et pacis propitius dona concedat,'<sup>5</sup> et faciem

<sup>1</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xix. c. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae*, lib. 1, c. xxx.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. ii. 13 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Coloss. iii. 9-11.

<sup>5</sup> *Secreta in Solemnitate Corporis Christi.*



orbis terrarum nova suae caritatis effusione renovet ad communem salutem.

Huius auspicem divini muneris benevolentiaeque Nostrae testem, apostolicam benedictionem vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, et Clero populoque vestro amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXIII maii, in festo Pentecostes, MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

[TRANSLATION]

## ENCYCLICAL LETTER

OF OUR MOST HOLY FATHER BENEDICT XV

### ON PEACE AND CHRISTIAN RECONCILIATION

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER  
ORDINARIES OF PLACES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE  
APOSTOLIC SEE,

BENEDICT XV, POPE

*Venerable Brethren, Salutation and Apostolic Benediction.*

Peace, the fairest gift of God, than which, in the words of St. Augustine,<sup>1</sup> even in temporal and mortal affairs, nothing sounds more pleasing, nothing is more desirable, nothing more noble of attainment—that peace which for more than four years has been the desire of the just, the prayer of the devout, the tearful mothers' supplication, has at length begun to shed its rays in every land, and We above all rejoice and are glad. But this fatherly joy is disturbed by numerous and grievous considerations, for even though war has everywhere to some extent ceased, and several peace-agreements have been signed, there still remain the seeds of ancient rivalries, and you, Venerable Brethren, rightly believe that no peace can be lasting, no treaty upheld, however long and laboriously arrived at, however strongly sanctioned, unless, by the reconciliation of mutual love, hatred and enmity are at the same time laid to rest. On a matter, therefore, of such great import for the common good, it is Our pleasure to address you, Venerable Brethren, and earnestly to warn your flocks.

We, in truth, ever since by the hidden design of God We have been raised to the dignity of this Chair of Peter, have never, during the war, ceased to put forth every effort to secure that all peoples would, as soon as possible, unite in fraternal reconciliation. Therefore We, with earnest entreaty and frequent exhortation, pointed out the paths of friendship and peace, and strove by every means in Our power, with God's help, to prepare for mankind the way to a just, honourable, and lasting peace, and all the while We sought with fatherly solicitation to alleviate the

<sup>1</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xix. c. xi.

terrible sufferings and afflictions which were the direct result of that dreadful slaughter. The charity of Jesus Christ which, in the critical inauguration of Our Pontificate, urged us to work for the return of peace, and to mitigate the horrors of war—that same charity, now that peace has at length returned, urges us to strongly exhort all the children of the Church and, indeed, all men to banish old-standing hatreds and to entertain concord and mutual love.

There is no need to prove what great injury would befall the human race if, after the signing of peace, latent enmities and discord between nations remained. We will not speak of the losses of those things by which civil life and progress are maintained—Commerce, Manufacture, Arts, Literature—these need the tranquil intercourse of peoples for their very life, but a more serious consideration is the fact that the foundation and expression of the Christian life, all whose strength lies in love, and whose preaching is called the *Good Tidings of peace*,<sup>1</sup> would be most seriously injured.

For, as you know, and as We have often recorded, nothing was so frequently and so strongly inculcated by Our Lord Jesus to His disciples as this precept of mutual love, for it embraces all. Christ called it the new commandment, and His own, and He wished it to be the distinguishing mark of the Christian. Finally, on the eve of His death, He so declared and besought them to love one another, and by loving to strive to imitate the unspeakable unity which belongs to the Trinity of Divine Persons—‘That all may be one . . . as we also are one . . . that they may be perfected in one.’<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, following in the footprints of the Divine Master and in full obedience to His words and precepts, the Apostles displayed a wonderful zeal in exhorting the faithful as follows: ‘But before all things have a constant mutual charity among yourselves’<sup>3</sup>; ‘But above all these things have charity which is the bond of perfection’<sup>4</sup>; ‘Dearly beloved let us love one another: for charity is of God.’<sup>5</sup>

Our brethren of these early centuries faithfully observed these counsels of Christ and the Apostles, for although they belonged to many different races they voluntarily sank the memory of their quarrels and lived in the most perfect concord. Such unity of heart and mind was a wonderful contrast to the deadly enmities which then raged within the bosom of the human family.

The same motives which have been adduced on the side of the precept of mutual love urge us also to forgive wrongs: and Our Lord commands no less strongly: ‘But I say to you, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you: that you may be the children of your Father Who is in heaven, Who maketh His sun to rise upon the good and bad.’<sup>6</sup> Hence the grave warning of the Apostle John: ‘Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. And you know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding

<sup>1</sup> Eph. vi. 15.

<sup>2</sup> John xvii. 21-23.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Peter iv. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Coloss. iii. 14.

<sup>5</sup> 1 John iv. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. v. 44, 45.



in himself.' <sup>1</sup> Finally we have been taught by Christ Our Lord when praying to God to declare that we wish to be forgiven according as we forgive others: 'Forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors.' <sup>2</sup> If, at times, it is difficult and trying to obey this law, the Divine Redeemer of the human race is at hand to remove every difficulty, not merely with the seasonable aid of His grace but even with His own example, Who, when dying on the cross, besought His Father for those who tortured Him so unjustly and so cruelly. 'Father,' says He, 'forgive them, for they know not what they do.' <sup>3</sup> We Who, however undeservedly, hold the place of Jesus Christ should, before all others, imitate His mercy and kindness, and We, therefore, after His example, forgive with Our whole heart each and every one of Our enemies who, knowingly or unknowingly, have attacked or now attack Our person or office with insult or injury whatsoever, and We embrace them all with the greatest zeal and good will, letting pass no opportunity of heaping on them every favour that We can. So too should every Christian worthy of the name do to those who, during the war, were the cause of injury to him.

But Christian charity is not satisfied if, instead of hating, we love our enemies as brothers. It requires us to treat them kindly after the example of Our Redeemer, 'Who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil,' <sup>4</sup> and Who brought to its close a life spent in doing good to men by shedding His very blood for them. Wherefore St. John says: 'In this we know the charity of God because He hath laid down His life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.' He that hath the substance of this world and shall see his brother in need and shall shut up his bowels from him: how doth the charity of God abide in him? My little children, let us not love in word, nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth.' <sup>5</sup> At no time were 'wider regions of charity' to be seen than in these days when all are laden and oppressed with the greatest distress: never was the human race in such need of that mutual beneficence which springs from a sincere love of our neighbour and is full of self-sacrifice and zeal. On whatever side we look the war has spent its fury: immense tracts of land lie in empty solitude, uncultivated and abandoned: peoples are in such sore distress that they lack even food, clothing, and shelter; there are innumerable widows and orphans dependent on chance support; and an incredible multitude of health-stricken infants and children whose weakened bodies are an eloquent testimony to the cruelty of the recent war.

While We contemplated the dreadful misery that mankind sinks under, We were reminded of that traveller in the Gospel <sup>6</sup> who, on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among robbers by whom he was stripped, beaten, and abandoned in a half-dying condition. There is a remarkable resemblance between the two cases, and just as in his case the merciful Samaritan, moved to mercy, came and dressed his wounds with oil and wine, brought him to the inn and cared for him: so too

<sup>1</sup> 1 John iii. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. vi. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxiii. 34.

<sup>4</sup> Acts x. 38.

<sup>5</sup> 1 John iii. 16-18.

<sup>6</sup> Luke x. 30 sqq.

may Jesus Christ, Whom the Samaritan represented, stretch forth His hand to heal the wounds of the human race.

The Church, which has inherited and still maintains the spirit of Jesus Christ, claims this work and office as her own: the Church whose whole life is a marvellous texture of manifold benefits: for she, 'the true mother of Christians, so maintains within her fold charity and love of neighbour that every remedy for the ills which sin brings to the souls of men may remain at her disposal.' Hence 'it is she trains and instructs children with gentleness, boys with strength, the aged with tranquillity, as the age and condition of mind as well as of body demand.'<sup>1</sup> It is hardly credible how powerful these works of Christian kindness are to soothe troubled minds and restore tranquillity abroad.

Wherefore, Venerable Brethren, We pray and beseech you by the charity of Christ that you strive in all zeal and earnestness to move those entrusted to your care to lay aside hatred and forgive injuries, and that you put forth even greater efforts to encourage those institutions of Christian beneficence which succour the needy, console the sorrowful, restore health to the sick; all, in fine, which in diverse fashion repair the immense ravages wrought by the war. We specially wish to impress on priests, the ministers of Christian peace, that they be assiduous in inculcating love towards friends and enemies, for this is the essence of the Christian life; and that 'being all things to all men'<sup>2</sup> they lead others by their example to carry on unceasing struggle against hatred and ill-will. In this wise they will render a most pleasing service to the loving Heart of Jesus and to Us also who represent Him, however unworthily, on earth.

In this connexion Catholic laymen who follow the profession of writing for the Press, or otherwise, should be advised and strongly encouraged 'to put on the bowels of mercy and benignity as the elect of God, holy and beloved,'<sup>3</sup> and to show forth that same spirit in their writings by refraining from false and useless incriminations and from violent and abusive language, which not merely conflicts with the law of Christ but serves only to reopen sores that had scarcely been healed, especially when men are still conscious of the past and are sensitive to the slightest touch.

The words with which We urge on all the duty of Christian charity We wish to address with special earnestness to those people who have been for years engaged in the strife of war, in order that the causes of conflict be as far as possible removed and friendly relations restored—without prejudice, of course, to the claims of justice. The Gospel law of charity which binds men as individuals, binds also when they are united into and constitute States and peoples. Now that the war is at an end, not merely charity, but even the very tendency of world-affairs, leads inevitably to universal peace, for all nations are, in these days, bound together by strong ties of mutual intercourse and beneficence—a condition of things

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Augustine, *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae*, lib. 1, c. xxx.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Coloss. iii. 12.



which has been much assisted by the greater respect for humanity and the wonderful progress of commerce.

This forgiveness of injuries and fraternal reconciliation of peoples, which the law of Christ so strongly commands and the very foundations of civilization require, has always been strongly urged by the Apostolic See, even when the war raged, as We have shown already, and no intrigue or strife succeeded in silencing its voice. With still greater energy We now urge and impress that same duty, once the treaties of peace have been concluded, as is shown in Our recent letters to all the Bishops of Germany<sup>1</sup> and to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris.<sup>2</sup> Since friendly relations between civilized nations are considerably advanced by the custom which has recently grown of meetings and conferences between the Heads of States for the purpose of arranging matters of importance, We, taking into consideration the changed condition of affairs and the tendency of the times, in order to assist the cause of peace and place no obstacle in its path, have decided to relax the severity of the conditions which, on account of the overthrow of the Temporal Power, Our Predecessors imposed on the ceremonial visits of Catholic Rulers to Rome. But We most clearly insist that this relaxation, which the critical situation of human affairs seems so strongly to counsel and demand, must not be interpreted as an abdication of the most sacred rights of the Apostolic See, as though It at last acquiesced in Its present abnormal situation. Quite the contrary; We take this opportunity of renewing in the same terms the solemn protest which Our Predecessors frequently made in defence of the rights and dignity of the Apostolic See, not through human motives but because of the sacredness of their office, and We again, even more emphatically, demand that, since international peace has been restored, the Head of the Church be relieved of that unreasonable situation which for many reasons is a serious danger to international concord.

In the general restoration of justice and charity and the reconciliation of nations it is much to be desired, Venerable Brethren, that all states enter, without misgiving, into a general society, or rather family, for the purpose of protecting their individual independence and for the preservation of order.

Such a comity of nations is recommended, amongst other reasons, by the widely felt need of abolishing or reducing military armaments which weigh so heavily on the resources of the State, and in this way war with its train of evils will be entirely avoided or at least rendered less menacing, and the liberty and territorial integrity of every nation safeguarded.

When nations are thus united under the law of Christ their efforts to uphold justice and charity will be supported by the active interest and assistance of the Church, which is itself the most perfect example of a universal society, and from its character and constitution wonderfully able to unite men not only for the purpose of their eternal salvation, but also for their temporal advancement, for it guides their footsteps through the things of this life so that they may not miss the happiness of the next.

<sup>1</sup> *Litterae Apostolicae Diuturni*, die xv Julii memxix.

<sup>2</sup> *Epist. Amor ille singularis*, die vii Octobris memxix.

We know, on the authority of history, how the ancient barbarian races of Europe, once they had been penetrated by the spirit of the Church, were gradually weaned from their countless rivalries and dissensions and united into a homogenous group from which, in time, sprang Christian Europe; so under the lead and auspices of the Church the nations retained their distinctive character, yet were knit together in a unity which did much for their common prosperity and glory. St. Augustine brilliantly describes <sup>1</sup> it thus: 'This heavenly city which is, as it were, in exile on earth, numbers its adherents from every race and tongue: it is not concerned with differences of customs, laws, and institutions which make or unmake the peace of nations: it does not seek to annul or destroy but preserves and maintains the distinctive characteristics of each in order to lead all to the goal of universal peace: provided the worship of the one true, supreme God be observed the Church does not interfere.' In the same strain the Holy Doctor addresses <sup>2</sup> the Church thus: 'You bring together in a union that is rather a brotherhood different states and different nations through the influence of their common origin from our first parents.'

Wherefore, to return to the subject of Our address, We salute in the first place Our own countless children, and in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ We pray and entreat them to lay aside mutual rivalries, to bury all wrongs in voluntary oblivion, to unite in the most sacred bond of a charity which holds none stranger or apart: next, We earnestly exhort the nations of the world to maintain the true peace of Christian good will by uniting in an abiding alliance, with justice its foundation; finally, We call upon all men and peoples to join themselves to the spirit and dispositions of the Catholic Church and through the Church to Christ, the Redeemer of the Human race: so We might address to all the words of Paul to the Ephesians: 'But now in Christ Jesus you who some time were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is Our peace Who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition . . . killing the enmities in Himself. And, coming, He preached peace to you that were afar off and peace to them that were nigh.'<sup>3</sup> Not less apposite is his message to the Colossians: 'Lie not to one another, stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new, him who is renewed unto knowledge according to the image of Him that created him: where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.'<sup>4</sup>

Meanwhile, placing Our trust in the intercession of Mary the Immaculate Virgin, whom We recently ordered to be invoked under the title of *Queen of Peace*, and of the three heavenly citizens whose canonization We lately decreed, in humble supplication We pray the Holy Spirit and Comforter 'graciously to impart to His Church the blessings

<sup>1</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xix. c. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae*, lib. 1, c. xxx.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. ii. 13 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Coloss. iii. 9-11.



of union and peace,'<sup>1</sup> and to renew the face of the earth with a fresh outpouring of His charity for the salvation of all.

In virtue of the divine mercy and as a mark of Our benevolence We lovingly impart the Apostolic Blessing to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, on the 23rd day of May, the Feast of Pentecost, 1920, in the Sixth Year of Our Pontificate.

BENEDICT PP. XV.

#### BI-CENTENARY OF THE PASSIONIST ORDER—LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS THE POPE

[The following letter has been addressed by His Holiness the Pope to Most Rev. Father Silvius, General of the Passionists, in connexion with the Bi-centenary of the Passionist Order, which will be officially celebrated on November 21 next, on which date, in the year 1720, St. Paul of the Cross made his religious profession.]

LETTER APOSTOLIC OF HIS HOLINESS, POPE BENEDICT XV, TO HIS BELOVED SON, SILVIUS OF ST. BERNARD, GENERAL OF THE PASSIONISTS.

BELOVED SON, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDECTION.

It was a happy thought of yours to send letters to all your religious, ordering public prayers for the solemn celebration of the second centenary of the foundation of the Institute, because in this way, remembering all the favours granted you by God up to the present time, you would all be moved to yield due and hearty thanks, and at the same time the memory of the merits and holy deeds of former members of the Institute would lead you to imitate them with renewed fervour. For, indeed, glorious were the proofs of the Divine goodness towards your Order, especially at the beginning when the Lord Jesus more than once visited the cell at Castellazzo, where your father and lawgiver had hidden, and filled his mind and soul with a special knowledge and love of Himself, thus fitting him to preach the mystery of the Cross; while the beloved Mother of Jesus, who has nothing so much at heart as that men should love her Son, crucified for our sake, lovingly appeared, clothed like yourselves in the garb of mourning, to Paul, and showed him openly that she looked upon himself and his sons as her special clients. No wonder then that with Our Lord for protector and His Mother for patroness, the Institute should soon show the marks of maturity, and have many members who spread everywhere the good odour of Christ. That your Founder excelled in every kind of virtue is clear as day, and the name of Paul which he bore became him admirably, because, in loving and preaching Jesus crucified, he hardly fell short of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. Besides, the first Passionists showed themselves not unworthy of their sainted Founder

<sup>1</sup> *Secreta in solemnitate Corporis Christi.*

may, we learn that many of them, by the example of an innocent life, and apostolic zeal, gained innumerable souls to Christ. Foremost among these is the Ven. Vincent Mary Strambi, whom your Founder esteemed so highly that he wished him to be near him when dying ; who, after filling in a holy manner the first offices in the Congregation, adorned the mitre with his great virtues. And this praise of holiness did not cease with him, for, to say nothing of others, all know how illustrious and splendid it was in the Ven. Dominic of the Mother of God, to whose wonderful zeal and constancy was in part due that movement of the English desirous to return to the bosom of Holy Mother Church, which they had abandoned in an evil day, a movement which happily goes on. At a later date, indeed almost in our days, there is your little flower of Christian perfection, who will soon be enrolled in the catalogue of the Saints, Gabriel of the Sorrowful Virgin, whose exaltation will be to your Order a fresh source of glory. We know that he arrived at the highest pitch of sanctity in no other way than by the observance of regular discipline, a proof that in the manner of life which you lead you have a perfect school of the virtues. And it is also a proof that the good spirit left you by your Founder still exists among you. But what vigilance, what earnestness of soul are necessary for you to keep intact at the present day this beautiful inheritance. These times, more than any past times, are opposed to Christian humility and penance, in which your manner of life chiefly consists ; for the pride of life and the insatiable love of pleasures so hold sway, that through the corruption of the very air that surrounds us it is difficult even for religious hearts to escape the infection of this pestilence. A further cause of the decay of morals was the awful war which obliged many to leave the cloister for the battle front, and exposed their virtue to all kinds of danger. Full of solicitude, therefore, no less for the common good than for your own salvation, you should labour to renew more and more in yourselves the love of the Cross of Christ, and by word and example stir up as many others as possible to the same love. Believing that the solemnities which are preparing will contribute powerfully to both these ends, we intend most willingly to augment their fruit and dignity out of the treasury of Holy Church, divinely placed at Our disposal. Accordingly, in virtue of Our apostolic authority, We grant, wherever you celebrate some public devotions to commemorate the auspicious event, that whoever visits any church of yours, or your nuns, shall obtain from God a plenary indulgence of his sins on the usual conditions. We also grant to the Superiors of your houses power to delegate to a Bishop or priest the faculty of imparting the Papal Blessing on that day to the people. And as a pledge of the divine gifts, which from Our heart We invoke upon you in abundance, and in testimony of Our paternal goodwill towards you, We most lovingly bestow on you, beloved Son, on all the members of your Congregation, and on the nuns of the Passion, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, 11 April, 1920, the Sixth Year of Our Pontificate.

POPE BENEDICT XV.



THE PRIVILEGE ATTACHING TO THE SOLEMNITY OF THE  
HOLY ROSARY DOES NOT EXTEND TO OTHER FEASTS

(*March 27, 1920*)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DUBIUM

DE SOLEMNITATE SACRATISSIMI ROSARII

Sacrae Rituum Congregationi, pro opportuna declaratione propositum fuit sequens dubium, nimirum: 'An privilegium, per Decretum Generale diei 28 octobris 1913 concessum solemnitati externae Sacratissimi Rosarii, quae Dominica I octobris celebrari poterit cum omnibus Missis, praeter conventualem et parochialem, de Ssño Rosario, extendi valeat ad alias quoque festivitates externas, quae peragi solent cum magno concursu populi?'

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, audito etiam specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus perpensis, rescribendum censuit: '*Negative*, quoad extensionem privilegii solemnitatis Sacratissimi Rosarii, iuxta Decretum Generale 28 octobris 1913.'

Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit die 27 martii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae  
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

# REVIEWS AND NOTES

DE DELICTIS ET POENIS : Praelectiones in Lib. v. Codicis Juris Canonici.

By Mgr. Giacomo Sole, D.Ph., D.D., J.U.D., Professor of Canon Law in the Pontifical Roman Seminary, Consultor of the S. Congr. of the Council and of the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Canons of the Code. Rome, New York, and Cincinnati : Fr. Pustet, 1920.

SCARCELY had the Code of Canon Law seen the light when the commentators were in the field, in a praiseworthy endeavour to lessen the labours of those who had to struggle with the new legislation. But it is to be feared that some of these hastily-complied works will not stand the test of time. Perhaps their authors are quite content to have supplied a pressing need, knowing that many others are soon to follow over the same ground.

Although the work of Monsignor Sole is the first, so far as we are aware, to deal with the whole treatise *De Delictis et Poenis*, comprising the fifth book of the Code, it will be a long time, we venture to think, before it is likely to be superseded. A professor for many years in the Apollinare University, now attached to the Pontifical Roman Seminary, Mgr. Sole has brought to his task the ripe scholarship and sound judgment which will give this Commentary a permanent value.

Within the limits of a short review it would be impossible, even if it were desirable, to enter into any minute description of the contents of the volume. In accordance with the prescriptions of the Sacred Congregation for Seminaries and Universities, Professors of Canon Law are bound, in their lectures, to adhere strictly to the order of the Code. This involves, in the present instance, a departure from the order of treatment of Censures in the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis*. Professor Sole quotes the text of each canon, and then submits it to an exhaustive analysis. In the preliminary portions particularly, where principles are enunciated and definitions given, the Commentary is as full and as clear as any student could desire.

Perhaps the most striking features of this work is the rich array of references to, and quotations from, the earlier legislation. Sometimes it is not easy to understand laws or institutions in their present form ; the difficulties are removed by an examination of their history and development. The student is thus made familiar with the literature of the subject, and is well prepared for subsequent investigation on his own account. In this respect, Professor Sole's Commentary is far ahead of any of the recent productions which we have seen. In addition, it should be



mentioned that brief marginal notes give the reader, at a glance, a synopsis of the matter explained in the text. Besides the analytical table of contents, the work is also provided with an excellent alphabetical index.

We congratulate Professor Sole on the appearance of this excellent Commentary, a work worthy, we may say, of the best traditions of the institution on whose professorial roll are inscribed the great names of Cavagnis, Giustini, and Lega. And we are glad to note the announcement that a similar commentary on the fourth book of the Code, on the difficult subject of Ecclesiastical Trials, is already in preparation.

P. O'NEILL.

Ἀν Σιόλανόρι. Vol. I, No. 1. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

A NEW Irish Magazine—Irish not only by birth and origin, but by language and sentiment! Ἀν Σιόλανόρι comes to us speaking the language of the Gael. It comes to speak of Ireland's Faith, of Ireland's past, of Ireland's hopes. *Ἐλευθερία, Ἑλλάς, Ἐὶς* are its watchwords. It is edited by a special Committee of *Κύματα* with Father Fleming, D.Ph., C.C., Westland Row, at their head. The promoters are to be congratulated on their courage and enterprise in putting a new Magazine on the market in spite of what they must know of the fate of Magazines in this country. We agree with them that the Magazine comes, notwithstanding, at an opportune moment. In a great number of dioceses the Bishops have made it a rule to ordain no one to the priesthood unless he is able to preach and hear confessions in Irish. Ἀν Σιόλανόρι, by publishing sermons and dissertations on theological questions, proposes to help priests and students in acquiring the requisite knowledge. It also proposes to serve as a medium of communication for priests already working for the language in widely separated areas. We trust that with the whole-hearted co-operation of the clergy the Magazine will grow and flourish and implant far and wide respect for our Faith and love for that ancient tongue

‘That as ivy to a ruin to our native land has clung.’

A word about the contents of the first number. Premier place is given to a propagandist article by Father Clenaghan of Belfast, who quotes largely from the French author, Louis Tréguiz, to show the deep interest that France, at least, has taken in the Irish Language Movement. Next we have a sermon delivered in a country chapel by Dr. Sheehan of Maynooth, in which we see what an amount of life and interest can be worked into a ten-minutes' discourse. Séamas Ó Searcaigh gives us a literary treat in his translation of Alphonse Daudet's touching little story *La Dernière Classe*. Father Paul Walsh contributes a *Μαρτυρία* of about 100 lines which he found in one of the late Dr. O'Hickey's books. *Ἡμετέριον Ὁλόν* is an instruction contributed by Father Patrick O'Carroll. The Panegyric preached by Father Patrick Casey on the occasion of the month's mind of Father Peter O'Leary, *Ἡμετέριον Ὁλόν* *ἐκείνου τοῦ ἁγίου*, is published in full in the Magazine. The last article is an instalment of a

translation of Pope Leo's Encyclical on Labour, *Rerum Novarum*, made by Father Peter O'Leary shortly before his death.

We must congratulate the Editor in securing neat and appropriate illustrations for the cover and for Séamas Ó Searcaigh's *Σεαττ'Οειρεσνναδ*. The initials would entitle one to hazard a guess that the illustrations are from the hand of an Irish priest, Father Martin Drea.

While admitting that it would be hard to bestow undue praise on the matter and tasteful appearance of the Magazine, we do not mean to imply that there is no ground for complaint left to the critic or fault-finder. On page 15 we find music and words of *Θσαν αν τσλάνιγτεοια*. We have no quarrel with the hymn itself nor with the music or words. But why should it occupy a page in this Magazine when it can be procured in a booklet for the modest sum of 3d. ? The Editor should rather be on the look-out for some of the literary treasures yet unpublished that are handed down amongst the peasants of Kerry, Galway, and Donegal.

A. B.

**THE MOTHER OF CHRIST; OR, THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY**, in Catholic Tradition, Theology, and Devotion. By O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.S.S.R. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.

THE writing of this book was a matter of obedience to a Superior's wishes. It was a happy inspiration on the part of the Superior. There is nothing like it in the English language, at least, so far as any book of the kind deals with both theology and piety, and with the place of Mary in the economy of man's redemption and sanctification. The author's *chief* desire has been to place before *English* people the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the great Mother of God as it has come down to us through the long course of the Christian ages. He has not evaded difficulties. On the contrary, any that are met with in ancient and in modern English writings are squarely faced and fought. He shows that, whatever may be the exact story of the development and evolution of devotion to Mary, this devotion has its roots, at least, in the earliest of the Fathers, as well as in the Gospels themselves. He shows also that the present attitude of Catholics to Our Lady is the inevitable result of the attitude and teaching of all preceding Christian centuries. There is no break between the teaching of St. Irenaeus and that of St. Alphonsus. The author quotes freely and at great length from the Fathers. That is only to be expected in a subject of this kind, as all who believe in historic Christianity must be deeply interested in that which has been written by the great Fathers of the East and the West on the matter.

The arrangement of the book may seem open to criticism. It is not the usual chronological one. In order to survey the whole field the author has chosen his own arrangement. Dogma, Scripture, History, Devotion, all run into one another, so that no hard and fast division is practicable. Hence, overlapping is unavoidable. But, one can easily



bear with a little overlapping on such a subject. The author has spent his life in preaching retreats and missions. We vividly remember, in student days, a retreat given by him. He was then not many years a convert. What particularly impressed us at the time was, besides his conviction and earnestness, his intense devotion to Mary. To preach about her, he says, has been the delight, the joy, and the consolation of his life. The present volume is a happy completion of his desire. He is afraid that in this book he betrays this habit of preaching. We can assure him that that is not so. The subject, at times, lends itself to effusiveness. But what reader will find fault with that where Mary is concerned? Who will not delight in reading of Mary's perfections and prerogatives even from the pen of a preacher? But the book is not in a preacher's style. On the contrary, it is in crisp, pithy, live style. The author has a vast field to cover. He does it in measured, sure steps. He has well thought out the whole and has filled in the parts with precision and thoroughness.

To name the chapters would give a poor idea of the book. Under every heading there is a wealth of information, and much that might not be expected. Still, to show the wide range of the book, we give the titles of the chapters: Mary's Life on Earth, Mary Conceived without Sin, Mary, Virgin Mother of God, Mary, Mother of Christians, Mary, Mother of the Man of Sorrows, Mary's Sorrows, Mary's Joys, The Sinlessness of Mary, Mary's Virtues, Mary at Cana, Mary during the Public Ministry of Christ, Mary's Words, Mary's Death and Glorious Assumption, Mary our Advocate, Mary Mother of Divine Grace, Mary Prefigured in Women of the Old Testament, Mary and the Church in Type and Prophecy, Mary and Ephesus, Images of Mary, Development of Devotion to Mary, Visions and Miracles of Mary, The Nature of True Devotion to Mary, Excellence of Devotion to Mary.

Under these headings whatever there is of Oriental tradition or of old English customs is appropriately introduced in support of the author's thesis. This is especially so in his chapters on Mary's Joys and the Images of Mary. Devotion to Mary's Joys was a special devotion in England before the Reformation, and, in particular, of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Of the holy images of Mary once honoured in the churches in Britain, only two remain. An image of Our Lady, once venerated at Buckfast in Devon, has been recently discovered, and, after restoration, has been placed once more over her altar in the Abbey church. A well-known statue of the Blessed Virgin, for many centuries venerated in Aberdeen, was saved, when all else was destroyed by the wickedness of John Knox and his followers, and has found a home in the parish church of Finisterre in Brussels, where it is known as Notre Dame du Bon Succes. None other belonging to the churches escaped the fury of the spoiler. One of the most useful and exhaustive studies in the book is the chapter on the Development of Devotion to Mary. We must also mention the chapter on Mary at Cana, on the words 'Quid mihi et tibi.' His reading of the phrase seems natural. Anyway, the discussion is enlightening. His warning as to over-symbolising is well-merited. Some modern writers

make themselves and religious things ridiculous by this habit. How any censor can give the *Imprimi potest* to such publications passes comprehension. There is a wealth of common sense and profound learning in the author. His book is a beautiful, devout and learned production.

M. R.

LA MESSE MÉDITÉE AU PIED DU S. SACREMENT. 2 Parts. LA PASSION MÉDITÉE AU PIED DU S. SACREMENT. 3 Parts. By M. l'Abbé A. Jos. Chauvin. Bureau des Œuvres Eucharistiques; Bassenge par Roelenge (Limbourg, Belge).

SOME years ago there was a 'Bureau de l'Apostolat de la Messe et de la Communion' at 96 Boulevard Saint-Germain, Paris. We do not know if it still exists. Its object was to make Holy Mass and Communion better known, appreciated, and loved. It published every month a Eucharistic review that, by various studies on the dogma, moral, and liturgy of the Mass and Communion, spoke of the wonders of the Altar and of the riches of the Adorable Sacrament, for the edification and encouragement of souls who truly love the Divine Eucharist. By the same bureau is published a book in two parts on Meditations on the Mass at the foot of the Altar. It is the putting into permanent form of all that the Eucharistic review aimed at and accomplished. It is more. It is a complete, well-thought-out, well-arranged series of beautiful meditations on the Mass from all points of view, dogma, moral, liturgy. These run into each other in all the meditations. An exquisite harmony of piety and knowledge is thus produced by a mind steeped in both. Knowledge provides the foundation, the accompaniment, but the melody, the hymn of praise, is skilfully composed and chanted by Piety. We cannot praise too highly the whole matter and arrangement. The pity is that these books have not been translated into English. We know of no book in English to be compared with them. The plan of every meditation is as follows: Preparatory Exercise (giving a short, precise summary of the dogma on the point selected for meditation); Meditation consisting of Adoration, Thanksgiving Propitiation, Prayer; Resolution. The same plan is followed out in the Meditations on the Passion at the foot of the Altar. In the Preparatory Exercise in these meditations, the whole scene is laid and graphically described according to the Gospels and to Ecclesiastical history.

These volumes cost about fr. 2.75 each. They are small, neatly bound, and beautifully printed, with over 400 pages in each. We heartily recommend them to all lovers of the Blessed Sacrament, and we can promise them a real surprise and a genuine treat. 'La Communion Méditée au pied du Saint Sacrement' is in preparation.

M. R.



# THE CULT OF BEATIFIED SERVANTS OF GOD

BY REV. J. B. O'CONNELL, B.A., B.D.

THE recent Beatification of Blessed Oliver Plunket (May 23, 1920) has occasioned a number of queries regarding the nature and extent of the cult of beatified Servants of God. Accordingly it may be of some interest to examine the legislation of the Church concerning this cult, and to see the principles which should guide us in honouring beatified Servants of God in general and Blessed Oliver Plunket in particular. This legislation is to be found in the *Codex Juris Canonici*, in the decrees of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, and in the Letters Apostolic of Benedict XV—*Ex quo Ecclesia Christi*—given on May 23, 1920, by which the honour due to the Blessed is decreed to the 'Venerable Servant of God Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, Martyr.'

Beatification is the act by which the Church, having passed judgment, either formally or equivalently, on the sanctity (or martyrdom) and miracles of a Servant of God, *permits* public worship, of a *limited* character, to be given to him.

Beatification is either formal or equivalent. It is formal when the Pope, after the judicial examination and approbation of the virtues (or martyrdom) of the Servant of God and of the miracles wrought through his intercession, by a positive act permits the title of *Blessed* to be given to the Servant of God and public worship, limited in nature and extent, to be offered to him. Equivalent beatification takes place if the Holy See, subsequent to a decree testifying to the fact of the immemorial worship and to the heroic character of the virtues (or to the martyrdom) of the Servant of God, confirms by decree this worship already given (Canon 2134). Whether a Servant of God be formally or only equivalently beatified the same acts of public worship are allowed in his regard (Canon 2135).

Canonization, on the other hand, is an act by which the Church, after a further examination of the heroic character of the virtues (or of the martyrdom) and of the miracles of a beatified Servant of God, solemnly declares—in a definitive decision—to the whole Church that he is numbered among the Saints, and is to be worshipped as such throughout the entire Church.

Accordingly there is a threefold difference between Beatification and Canonization :—(i) The former is a preparatory act, a stage on the way to a goal ; the latter a definitive act, the attainment of the goal. (ii) Beatification is a permission to accord worship because of sanctity and consequent beatitude which is morally certain ; Canonization is a precept to accord worship because of sanctity and beatitude which have been proclaimed by an authentic and definitive and, probably, infallible act. (iii) Beatification permits a limited cult of *dulia* limited in its nature and extent ; Canonization commands the full cult of *dulia*, without limitation, and throughout the universal Church.

The cult, then, which may be given to beatified Servants of God is *public* worship, namely, worship given in the name of the Church, by persons legitimately authorized and by acts instituted by the Church (Canon 1256). Accordingly it differs entirely from the cult which may be given to Servants of God who have died with a reputation for sanctity, or to those entitled *Venerable* (i.e. those Servants of God, the cause of whose beatification has been duly begun, and has reached the stage at which a decree, authentically declaring that all the virtues in a heroic decree of the Servant of God or his martyrdom have been proved, has been issued by the Holy See—Canon 2115). To these latter only *private* worship can be offered.

On the other hand, while public cult may be accorded to the Beatified, it is a public cult which is limited to certain acts, and which can be offered only by certain persons and in certain places. In this it differs from the worship of canonized saints—which is an *unlimited* worship of *dulia*, prescribed for all the faithful, and throughout the entire Church. Accordingly *Codex Juris Canonici*, Canon 1277, lays down (1) that ‘only those Servants of God, who have been by the authority of the Church inscribed in the catalogue of the Saints or Beatified, may be worshipped with public cult,’ and (2) ‘to those canonically inscribed on the roll of the Saints the cult of *dulia* is due ; the Saints



may be worshipped everywhere and by every act of this kind of worship, but the Beatified only in the place and according to the manner conceded by the Roman Pontiff.'

The limitations imposed on the public worship which may be offered to the Beatified are found in decrees of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, and in the *Codex Juris Canonici*, which simply embodies, without modification, the legislation of the Congregation.

Public worship is accorded to the Saints by (a) appointing a day on which their feast may be celebrated and permitting altars to be erected in their honour, (b) the celebration of Mass and the recitation of the Divine Office on their feast day, in their honour and with special mention of their names, (c) the exposition of their relics and images for public veneration, (d) their election as Titulars of churches and altars, and as Patrons of congregations or places, (e) the inclusion of their names in the calendars of churches or religious Orders, and in the Roman Martyrology.

Regarding all these points of public worship of the Saints a limitation is imposed—unless removed by indult—on the cult of the Beatified:—

(a) The anniversary of the beatification cannot be celebrated with an Office (S.R.C.—D. 447 ad 5), nor can the feasts of the Beatified be celebrated with an octave, but only in the manner allowed by indult (D. 942). The Beatified may not be invoked in public prayers, except in those permitted by the Holy See (D. 1130 ad 9 et 10).

(b) Only by special and express concession may the Mass and Office of the Beatified be said, and this faculty cannot be presumed from permission to erect altars in honour of the Beatified (S.R.C.—D. 1130 ad 3).

Again, where permission is given for the cult of the Beatified, the faculty of the public recitation of his Office cannot on that account be presumed (D. 1130 ad 5). When the Mass of the Beatified is conceded, it is granted only for a certain place (country or diocese) or to certain persons (e.g., a religious Congregation), and only in the churches (or oratories) of these places or persons can the Mass be celebrated.

A votive Mass of a Beatified is not allowed (cf. S.R.C.—D. 1568), for even when his Mass is permitted it is granted only for a particular day and cannot be celebrated at other times, for the worship of a Beatified must be kept strictly within the limits of the indults permitting it.

(c) Regarding the relics of the Beatified—if they are *insignes* (namely, the body, head, arm, forearm, heart, tongue, hand, leg or that part of the body in which a martyr suffered, provided it be entire and not small—Canon 1281, § 2) they may not be preserved in private houses or private oratories, without express permission of the Ordinary (Canon 1282, § 1). Only those relics may be honoured in churches with public worship, whose genuineness is guaranteed by an authentic document from the hand of a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, or of the Ordinary of the place, or of an ecclesiastic who has by Apostolic indult the faculty of authenticating relics (Canon 1283). When exposed, relics should be closed up in cases and sealed (Canon 1287), and lights should burn before them (S.R.C.—DD. 2067 ad 9, 3029 ad 13, 3204). The relics of the Beatified may not, without special indult, be carried in procession (Canon 1287, § 3; S.R.C.—D. 1130 ad 11); nor may they be exposed in churches, except where the Office and Mass of the Beatified are celebrated by concession of the Holy See (Canon 1287, § 3; S.R.C.—D. 1156 ad 4).

Images (pictures or statues) of the Beatified may not be exposed to veneration in churches, oratories, and other public places—whether on the altar or outside it—without leave of the Holy See (S.R.C.—DD. 1097 ad 1, 1130 ad 1). Where the Holy See grants an indult allowing such images to be placed in the church and worshipped, the faculty is to be understood as permitting these images on the walls but not on the altar (S.R.C.—D. 1130 ad 2). On the other hand, wherever the Mass of the Beatified is, by indult, allowed, his image and votive tablets may be exposed on the altar (S.R.C.—D. 1156 ad 1; cf. Canon 1287, § 3). Since it is forbidden to carry the relics of the Beatified in processions, *a fortiori* his image may not be carried in processions. If the name of the Beatified be recorded in the Roman Martyrology, it cannot therefore be concluded that his image may be exposed everywhere for public veneration (cf. S.R.C.—D. 1162).

(d) Neither churches nor altars (even in churches and oratories to which the Office and Mass of the Beatified is granted) can be dedicated to a Beatified without Apostolic Indult (Canons 1168, § 3, and 1201, § 4; S.R.C.—DD. 2353, 2809). Nor can a Beatified be chosen, without special indult of the Apostolic See, as patron of a country, diocese, province, confraternity, religious Order, etc. (Canon 1278).



(e) Finally, the names of the Beatified may not be inscribed in the Roman Martyrology (S.R.C.—D. 16151); nor may they be inserted in local Calendars or in those of religious Orders, except where the Office and Mass of the Beatified has been granted (S.R.C.—D. 1130 ad 8).

To come now to the particular case of the Blessed Oliver Plunket. The nature and extent of the worship which may be offered to him is determined by the general legislation detailed in the first part of this article, and by the Letters Apostolic of Benedict XV, given on May 23, of the present year.

(1°) In future the Venerable Oliver Plunket is to receive the title 'Blessed.' Accordingly, he is henceforth—until his canonization (which we trust may be speedily accomplished)—a subject for public, but limited, worship of *dulia*.

(2°) His body and relics may be exposed for public veneration, *but may not be carried in public procession (in sollemnibus supplicationibus)*.

(3°) His images may be decorated with rays. (They may not be decorated with the aureola, which is reserved for canonized saints.)

(4°) The Office of the Beatified (taken from the Common of one Martyr with proper lessons) may be recited and a Proper Mass may be celebrated yearly in the dioceses of Ireland and Australia, and in the churches and oratories of the College and other Institutes of the Irish in Rome.

This concession of the Holy See is especially generous, as it is usual to grant the Mass and Office of a Beatified only to the diocese or religious Order to which he belonged.

(5°) Finally, the Holy See permits the solemn celebration of the Beatification of Blessed Oliver Plunket to be celebrated in the dioceses of Ireland and Australia and in the Irish College at Rome within a year of the completion of a similar celebration at the Vatican Basilica.

This solemn celebration usually consists in the celebration of the Mass and Office of the Beatified, with major double rite, on a day to be fixed by the Ordinary.

The Letters Apostolic make no mention of the date appointed for the annual celebration of the Mass and Office of Blessed Oliver Plunket, but we understand that he is to be honoured on July 11, the anniversary of his martyrdom.

J. B. O'CONNELL.

# DR. MURRAY OF MAYNOOTH

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY

## III

DURING the year in which Murray wrote his letter to O'Connell there appeared Thackeray's 'Irish Sketch Book.' Of course a literary tramp must make copy, and copy palatable to his readers ; so the English cynic sneers at all things Catholic—the nuns in Cork, the Trappists in Melleray, the poor starving ragged beggars, the Mass hearers at Skibbereen, Archbishop MacHale, Maynooth and its students. In criticizing the College he was quite within his right and duty. It was a Government establishment, started and run by taxpayers' money and kept in repair (?) by the zealous, thoughtful, generous Board of Public Works. The novelist found squalor, but he does not charge this to the Board's methods but to the tenants ! Nearly all visitors were shocked at the sight of the much-talked-of and scoffed-at College, its mean buildings, and Thackeray writes 'an Irish Union house is a palace to it.' Whose fault was it ? Of the students he wrote :—

The poor freshman has but twelve hours of hearty human natural life. To-morrow, they will begin their work on him ; cramping his mind, biting his tongue, and firing and cutting at his heart—breaking him to pull the Church chariot. . . . Why should a stranger after a week's stay in the country, be able to discover a priest by the scowl on his face and his doubtful downcast manner ? Is it a point of discipline that his reverence should be made to look as ill-humoured as possible ? And I hope these words will not be taken hostilely.

Surely, these words and scores of similar remarks made by dozens of other critics must have cut Father Murray to the quick, for he loved and adored his fellows and his College. Before leaving Thackeray, I ask readers to recall the figures in his drawings. Some of the men wear the graceful knee breeches and others appear in long garments. He visited Ireland in the period of transition when men were abandoning the short garment. Transition was going on in the



College of St. Patrick. Nearly all the students were covering their calves in broadcloth, when a fierce difference of opinion arose : mythology tells us of the apple of discord, sober history tells us of the great schism caused by a diphthong, and some say that the French Revolution arose out of a gift of a necklace. The longer garment refused to hang gracefully and fixedly on the cincture or belt methods of the short one. The College superiors—shocked, pained and grieved at the unaesthetic and unseemly hitching—ordered or hinted that the new garment must not be cinctured, that it demanded and required suspension. Some students refused the suspension method, refused to abandon the leather cincture, and *ferenda sententia* were expelled !

During the remaining years of the 'forties the history of the Irish Church is sad, very sad. The people in their misery and poverty were struggling to buy plots of lands, sites for schools, and churches. In many of the counties, landlord opposition to the purchase of those plots was unrelenting. Hence, some of the old churches built eighty years ago were not placed centrally and conveniently ; and schools were built, or rather run up, at haphazard in very unsuitable locations for the wants and needs of the Catholic parents and children. The peasantry were in hovels ; the priests lived in one-roomed lodgings in poor cottages. Clothing was scant. The rags of the Irish was a standing joke with Thackerary, and a sorrow to good Sir Walter Scott in his Irish tour. Food was of the poorest kind, and hunger, before and after the famine and its fevers, was the lot of priest and peasant. The revenue and intention books for 1843, of the priest who was pastor where I write, are typical of the state of affairs in many an Irish parish. The good man had as revenue in that year £68 12s., and he received 114 stipends for Masses, the stipends being two shillings and half-a-crown. And he built a church, to accommodate 300 worshippers, at a cost of £400. Let a masterhand describe the priests of that period :—

Then came Maynooth, which, founded on governmental subsidies, poured from its gates the strongest, fiercest, most fearless army of priests that ever fought for the spiritual and temporal interests of the people,—men of large physique and iron constitutions, who spent ten hours a day on horseback, despised French claret, loved their people and chastised them like fathers, but were prepared to defend them with their lives and the outpouring of their blood against their hereditary enemies. Intense in their faith, of stainless lives and spotless reputations, their words cut like razors, and their hands smote like lightning ; but they had the hearts

of mothers for the little ones of their flocks. They had the classics at their finger tips, could roll out lines from Horace or Virgil at an after-dinner speech, and had a profound contempt for English literature. In theology they were rigorists, too much disposed to defer absolution and to give long penances. They had a cordial dislike for new devotions, believing that Christmas and Easter Communion was quite enough for ordinary sanctity. Later on they became more generous, but they clung with tenacity to the Brown Scapular and the First Sunday of the Month. I am quite sure they have turned somersaults in their graves since the introduction of the myriad devotions that are now distracting and edifying the faithful. But they could make and did make, too often, perhaps, for Christian modesty, the proud boast that they kept alive the people's faith, imbued them with a sense of the loftiest morality, and instilled a sense of intense horror for such violations of Church precepts as *communicatio cum hereticis in divinis*, or the touching of flesh meat on a day of abstinence.<sup>1</sup>

Such were the pupils sent out from the classes of Father P. A. Murray, Professor of Theology, Maynooth. Such were the men before whom the good man refrained from political references, lest he should raise their minds from study, and the repose and concentration of mind which are necessary for the prosecution of theological study.

The progress and results of the Irish famine of 1847 have been often told. But, perhaps, its causes are not so well known. It is surprising to read that God sent the famine because of Maynooth! Yet the *Achill Missionary Herald* (August, 1846, page 88) wrote:—

The Protestant members of the House of Lords and Common have sworn before God and the Country that Popery is idolatrous; our Queen, at her coronation, solemnly made a similar declaration, yet all have concurred in passing a Bill to endow a college for training priests to defend and practise and perpetuate this corrupt and damnable worship in this realm. The ink wherewith the signification of royal assent was given to that iniquitous measure was hardly dry when the *fatal rot* commenced its work of destruction; and as the stroke was unheeded, and there was no repentant effort to retrace the daring step of the first iniquity, but rather a disposition to multiply transgression, we are now visited with a second and a severer stroke of judgment.

The years succeeding the famine found the numbers in Father Murray's classes greatly reduced. The poverty of the people made preliminary training nearly impossible for aspirants to Maynooth. Mortality was high in all parts of the island and in all sorts of the Irish, especially amongst boys in their teens. Then, too, the great mortality amongst the over-wrought and heartbroken clergy of the rural districts gave the Bishops no alternative but one, and that one so fatal always and everywhere—they ordained men of

<sup>1</sup> Sheehan, *My New Curate*, Chap. xvii.



scant knowledge—one or two years in Maynooth was a usual course. Those poor men were as the raw conscript levies in war, undisciplined, ignorant, weak. What happened in Europe after the scourges of the Black Death in the fourteenth century, happened in Ireland in the nineteenth. Necessity made demands, the demands were met, but standards of training, of learning and of piety were lowered exceedingly, and this ruinous course shamed the Catholic Church in Ireland. Even as late as 1870, at the first synod of Maynooth, a document from Rome was read which drew tears from the eyes of her honoured priests.

In 1846 a priest of Clogher diocese writes to Father Murray of Maynooth to thank him for his letters about his brother, and to wish success to the new Catholic magazine which Fathers Murray and Crolly and this Dublin man were issuing. The writer was Father Michael Duffy, brother of James Duffy, publisher, whose name is world wide. James Duffy was a native of Ballytrain, Co. Monaghan. He was born in 1809 and died in 1871. Starting life as a pedlar in Louth and Meath he made his way to Dublin, and started in a small way in Anglesea Street, where he issued thousands of cheap Catholic and national publications. In Duffy's edition of the *Missale Romanum* in 1859, Cardinal Cullen—and he was a man sparing in praise—wrote of Duffy, 'qui ob innumeros libros pietate Christiana insignes typos suos editos praeclare de Religione Catholica meritus fuerit, quique industria sua inopiam librorum bonorum suppleverit qua haec regio tamdiu gravissima afflicta persecutionibus laborabat.' His praises are sung too by Mr. Charles Gavan Duffy: 'Mr. James Duffy, whose liberality contributed largely to create a national literature in Ireland, was a man of shrewd sense and sly humour.' James Duffy was related to Father Murray, and the Maynooth men rallied around the enterprising publisher, whose books were and are to be found in millions of Irish Catholic homes. Dr. Callan was busy translating St. Alphonsus, and from Duffy's press were going hundreds of copies of 'The Glories of Mary,' 'St. Liguori on the Commandments,' 'Visits to the Blessed Sacrament,' 'Selva,' 'The Preparation for Death,' and Father Murray and Father C. P. Meehan were aiding the publisher by reading gratuitously the proofs. Thousands of cheap prayer-books, of the type of Pinamonti's 'Walking with God,' Gobinet's instructions, lives of saints, pious stories, popular histories were issued and sold with

great rapidity, and the Maynooth dons were literary tasters, proof-readers and authors. Dr. Russell translated beautifully Canon Schmid's *Tales* and Father Crotty wrote a pious story 'Mary Anne O'Halloran.' The Maynooth men were of far more practical help than were Gavan Duffy, Gerald Griffin, and Carleton. Crotty and Murray wrote a great number of articles for Duffy's *Catholic Magazine* and *Fireside Magazine*. Why all their labour? Because Ireland was bookless, her young people had nothing to read, nothing to teach them their religion, their history, and vicious Protestant tracts filled the land. Hence James Duffy's cheap books were a blessing and a great blessing to Ireland in the sad 'forties and 'fifties and 'sixties of the nineteenth century, and those heroic priests in Maynooth did wonders by their energy, their judgment, and their steady, silent work for their faith and fatherland. 'The spirit of the Nation' is glorious, but more glorious was Ireland's faith, fostered by Duffy and those professors.

In the Spring of 1849 an old beast, Thomas Carlyle, visited Ireland as the guest of Mr. Gavan Duffy, and he brought the bitter old Scot to see his friends, and one of his warmest and truest was Professor Murray. Everything in Ireland appeared to please the Sage, but on his return to England he vomited venom on all Ireland, her works and pomps. 'For me and some of my friends,' wrote Duffy (*Young Ireland*, Part 2, chap. vi.) 'he has only kind words, but scarcely any one else escapes his sarcasm, an instrument of torture so trenchant that it ought to be reserved for public offenders.' The sarcasm embraced little Professor Murray. 'Met Dr. Murray of Maynooth. A big burly mass of Catholic Irishism . . . head cropt like stubble, red-skinned face, harsh grey Irish eyes; full of fiery Irish zeal, too, and rage, which, however, he had the art to keep down under buttery volubles; man of considerable strength; man not to be "loved" by any manner of means.' The Scot is wrong in nearly every phrase. Murray was not big. He had not harsh eyes, as one was sightless, he never showed 'rage,' and he was a much loved man by priests, pupils and layfolk.

Ulstermen are said to be very canny, very sly, very knowing. Perhaps it was true of Murray, for he used the conversation with the old Scot who wrote of the Irish priesthood, 'the dirty, muddy minded, semi-felonious, proselytizing Irish priest.' It happened probably after dinner! The



Professor drew from the Sage a letter of introduction to the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, the great quarterly which then was publishing Lord Macaulay's Essays, the essays of Brougham and Jeffrey, the great thinkers, essayists, and literary lions of that day. How the trick on the visitor must have delighted the humorous soul of the Professor; how the honour of appearing in the high-class periodical must have been doubly delightful to him (see his letter to C. G. Duffy, *Irish Monthly*, Vol. xx. p. 582). His essay appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, 1852, and deals with Carleton's stories of Ulster life. The editor, Empson, had asked Murray to name the subjects he would like to write upon:—

I did so [writes Murray to Duffy], and among them was Carleton. This he selected. I accordingly wrote an article, and sent it to him the first week in May, or at the end of April. In less than a week after, I had the article back, printed in full, with the MS. corrected in places—to all which corrections (they were merely verbal), I agreed, except two, which I gave my reasons for not admitting, to which reasons Empson at once agreed. The article was printed with hardly a mistake, even in a letter—which shows the way those people have of doing business. Empson said it is a very interesting article. It is simply and plainly written and in a spirit of very kindly feeling to Carleton, though I point out faithfully what I believe to be his damning faults.

It is the very best piece of literary criticism ever penned by Murray, and is well worthy of the *Review* and of the Maynooth staff. Of Carleton, we shall see more later in these pages. Murray's attitude to him is a puzzle to many.

E. J. QUIGLEY.

# THE CONFESSION OF INTERNAL SINS

BY REV. DAVID BARRY

THERE is a special difficulty for the confessor in estimating the malice of internal sins, due to the fact that, because of inadvertence or the deliberate withholding of his assent to some aspects of them, the sinner may escape responsibility for a certain amount of the evil that attaches to the object of his thought.

This possibility need not usually be taken account of in the case of an external sin, for as a rule it may be taken for granted that one who commits it, has at least a confused knowledge—which is sufficient to entail responsibility—of the different species of malice it contains. And a state of indifference to any one of them, and even a positive detestation and express disavowal of it, will not ordinarily relieve him of accountability for it. Because, when such a sin is committed, there is a predominant act of the will covering it and all the elements that compose it. Whereas if the evil act or other object be merely represented in the imagination and intellect, it may be possible to abstract from some or all of the circumstances making it evil, and to bring it within the influence of the will independently of these.

Now, it is with a view to ascertaining when this may be supposed to happen that moralists devote a special chapter to investigating the malice entailed by the commission of internal sins. And for this purpose they are divided into three classes : (a) sinful thoughts and the corresponding acts of the will ; (b) pleasure in past sins ; and (c) sinful desires. The first class, technically called *delectationes morosae*, are formed without any reference to their realization in the future or in the past. So that the objects of them are purely imaginary ; but nevertheless the very contemplation of these <sup>1</sup> is calculated to give a certain amount of pleasure

<sup>1</sup> The difference between taking pleasure in one's knowledge of an object and in the object as represented in the mind is too clear to need elaboration.



and satisfaction, varying with their seductiveness in relation to the temperament—natural or acquired—of the person who entertains them.

Well, the theologians are very much divided as to how far the retention of these thoughts, after advertence to the complacency of which they are the source in the will, makes one answerable for the different sorts of evil that may be inherent in the object represented, and that do not contribute to arousing this satisfaction. The view that Lessius calls ‘*magis recepta et fere communis*’ is that one who sins in this way, contracts the malice of all the circumstances to which he adverts even in a dim and confused manner. So that he is bound to disclose in confession every quality of what is depicted in his mind that he would be bound to tell if it were externalized; and this, even though a particular detail may have actually lessened his pleasure in the representation.

On the other hand, according to St. Alphonsus,<sup>1</sup> dealing with the Sixth Commandment, violations of which are more commonly the subject-matter of the acts in question: ‘*Hi (Lugo, Vasquez, Laymann, etc.) tenent quod si quis delectatur de copula cum nupta, non qua nupta, sed qua muliere pulchra, etc., non contrahit malitiam adulterii; circumstantia enim adulterii tunc non intrat in delectationem; idcirco tantum castitas non justitia laeditur.*’ But for himself the Saint says, ‘*valde mihi placet (dicere) quod, licet ratione delectationis non sit obligatio explicandi circumstantiam adulterii; est tamen in praxi explicanda ratione periculi proximi concupiscendi (saltem ineffaciter) mulierem illam nuptam, in quod se conjicit qui de ea delectatur.*’ Thus he bases the need of being detailed on the danger that there undoubtedly is of the mere pleasure in the representation of a seductive object developing into a desire for its possession. Other authorities, however, come to the same conclusion on the more fundamental ground of the well-known principle that acts derive their special character from their objects. Cajetan,<sup>2</sup> for instance, says: ‘*Delectatio . . . de fornicatione sequitur naturam fornicationis; et delectatio adulterii sequitur naturam adulterii, etc., quas luxurie species constat ex objectis specificari.*’

<sup>1</sup> *Theologia Moralis* (Gaudé's ed.), lib. v. cap. ii. n. 15.

<sup>2</sup> In 2am 2ae q. 154, art. 4 in resp. ad 2am.

According to Lehmkuhl,<sup>1</sup> who in this as in so many other departments holds a middle course, 'saltem sufficere videtur indicasse seu interrogasse . . . de quo supposito morosa delectatio versata esset, utrum de altero sexu, an de eodem, an de aliis peccatis contra naturam (quae certo non omnia semper distincte interrogari licet).' And his reason for requiring the disclosure of such particulars and of these only is, that the representation of them, unlike, for example, that of relationship, may conduce somewhat to the unlawful pleasure in the case.

As for the theoretical solution of the dispute, it must be said in favour of those who hold the strict opinion that it seems *prima facie* true that unless some satisfaction be derived from each circumstance there is no conclusive reason why it should be represented in the imagination at all. But in answer it has been contended that what is peculiarly the subject of the sinner's will is presented to it in a certain setting, because this belongs to it objectively—outside his mind. And as an alternative argument it may be pointed out that if a *desire* be entertained, responsibility for all the constituents of the malice of its object is contracted, even though some of them may do nothing towards alluring the will. Similarly, it is compulsory to confess all the specifically distinct circumstances, including neutral or forbidding ones, of a *past sin* which has been called to mind and dwelt on with deliberate satisfaction.

Now, in regard to our practice in the confessional, it is to be noted that inasmuch as the mild view, exempting the confessor from the duty of finding out anything except the main subject that engrossed his penitent's thought and appealed to his will, is influentially supported, we are quite within our right in acting on it. And moreover, as in some cases going into details that it is not obligatory on the sinner to disclose is, to say the least, highly inadvisable, we should be careful not to put definite or set questions with a view to eliciting such secondary circumstances. But in deference to the more common opinion, and especially for the reason that evil thoughts being so likely to culminate in evil desires, it is hard for penitents to distinguish between them, it may be well to put a vague question that would give them an opportunity of telling any special element of malice of which they are conscious.

<sup>1</sup> *Theologia Moralis*, 11th ed., i. n. 363, 2.



The second class of internal acts are arranged under the head of complacency (*gaudium*) by a person in a past sin of his, or in some other evil that has happened. And it is quite certain that such a one incurs the entire guilt of the past offence, which from the moral point of view he in effect duplicates by his attitude towards it. So that it is not only what he sees now or saw before as the specially enticing factor in the case, that he is bound to confess, but whatever went to constitute the entire concrete evil in the past. Of course it may be that he has forgotten part of this, or, especially if he is thinking over the sin of another, that it was never known to him in its entirety. But in so far as he now realizes the true character of the act as it took place, his complacency in, or approval of, it must be taken as covering all its details, even though he would otherwise be indifferent to some of them or positively detest them.

The question now arises as to whether what is in the main evil may be under any aspect a legitimate object of satisfaction; for evil, present or past, is sometimes more or less diluted, inasmuch as good effects may accrue or may have accrued from it. Now, is it lawful to take pleasure in these as considered apart from the evil that gave rise to them? Well, there can be no objection to this, supposing always that the danger of approving the bad cause in the good effect is provided against by keeping them mentally detached. And going a step further, it has to be considered whether one's gratification may not be more extensive; whether, namely, if there is or was no subjective sin in the cause, but evil that is purely physical or tainted with objective malice, the cause *itself* may be an object of complacency by reason of the good it has occasioned. Now, if the act originating this was saved from being sinful merely by the inadvertence of the agent, one's approval must stop short at the effect and may not extend to what, though a physical evil, borders on the sphere of morals.<sup>1</sup> This view is now practically certain, and was constructively taught by Innocent XI, when he condemned a proposition to the effect that it is lawful for a son who, when he was drunk, killed his father to take pleasure in the involuntary parricide by reason of a great access of riches it has brought him.

But at one time such distinguished authorities as Vasquez

<sup>1</sup> In the language of the Human Acts treatise: *Malum physicum attingens morale.*

and Lessius<sup>1</sup> taught that an act of this kind might be a legitimate object of complacency, not of course by reason of its direct effect, but as the cause or occasion of the good eventuating. Indeed, some of the patrons of this opinion—Vasquez at least—seem to have gone to the dangerous extreme of maintaining that it held, even though the cause was formally and subjectively sinful.

And even at present Lehmkuhl, for instance, so attenuates the common view that he is able to hold that one who has through inadvertence broken the fast can rejoice that he has done so, inasmuch as his depleted strength is thereby restored.<sup>2</sup> And the same author teaches<sup>3</sup> that a person who, in his drunkenness, has burned his house, and expects to get a better one built at the expense of an Insurance Company, can take pleasure—not in his act—but in the conflagration which was the direct effect of it.

Where good has resulted from a *purely* physical evil, e.g., the natural death of anyone, some theologians sanction the taking of complacency in the cause, stipulating only that the order of charity existing between the different members of Almighty God's family be not violated; in other words, provided the evil caused to the detriment of one is not altogether disproportionate to the good effected for the benefit of another. So if an event has entailed a great loss to my neighbour while securing a comparatively small gain to myself, I may congratulate myself indeed on my good fortune, but not on the cause of it under any aspect; whereas I could do this, if the good and the evil were more or less balanced. Other theologians,<sup>4</sup> however, put physical evil of the kind in question in the same absolutely prohibited category as what is objectively sinful, in so far as taking subsequent satisfaction in them is concerned.

Applying the principles<sup>5</sup> laid down, we find the authorities allowing a person<sup>6</sup> to take pleasure in the death of his neighbour when this has resulted in the clear spiritual advantage

<sup>1</sup> See St. Alphonsus, *op. cit.* n. 20.

<sup>2</sup> He is only one of many who distinguish 'inter prohibita jure naturae, ac prohibita tantum jure humano; et delectationem affirmant illicitam circa primum genus, non item quoad alterum, modo non fiat sub ratione prohibitionis.'

<sup>3</sup> *Casus*, i. n. 146.

<sup>4</sup> See Tanqueray, *Theol. Moralis*, i. n. 502.

<sup>5</sup> And these hold also of course in the converse case of regret and sadness at a virtuous action or state, or at the temporal well-being of another.

<sup>6</sup> For this and the following cases see St. Alphonsus, *loc. cit.* n. 22.



of the deceased or of someone else ; for instance, if an end is thereby put to his career of sin and scandal. Because the requirements of charity, postponing the temporal order to the spiritual, are observed in such a case. Similarly no difficulty need be made about rejoicing in the death or temporal misfortune of an individual, if this redounds to the advantage of the Church or the State, as would the punishment of a malefactor. And some go so far as to hold that a father can take pleasure in, or desire, the death of his son, who, if he lived, would probably disgrace his family by his crimes.

But on the same principle, the majority of theologians do not allow a woman to wish for the death of her daughter who is a burden to her, being so uncomely or poor that she cannot marry or marry a good husband. Because death as a temporal evil outweighs any other one—at least if this affects a different individual. Though if a life of illness and hardship be the only alternative, there is a certain amount of probability that a person can desire *his own* death as an avenue of escape from it ; of course with due submission to the holy will of Almighty God.

In further reference to desires, it is to be noted in the first place that one who conceives them without any condition, and forms them for the purpose of putting them into execution, unquestionably contracts, and must tell in confession, the complete malice of the act depicted in his mind. There is explicit Scriptural authority for this : ‘ *Qui viderit mulierem ad concupiscendam eam, jam moechatus est eam in corde suo.*’<sup>1</sup>

As for velleities or desires that it is not proposed to externalize, because to do so is physically impossible, or is inconvenient or undesirable for some ordinary secular reason, it is also quite certain that one who cherishes them is guilty of all the circumstances which attach a specifically distinct malice, and which he apprehends in the object of his desire. Though inadvertence to subordinate malice in such cases is more likely than when an absolute and definite purpose of committing sin is conceived.

However, it may be that an intention remains a mere velleity for a spiritual reason ; in other words, because a person is so disposed that he will not commit a certain act because it is a sin. Now, it is the common, though not the

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v. 28.

universal view <sup>1</sup> of theologians, that, if the act in question is forbidden by the natural law, it is unlawful to cherish a desire in regard to it, even based on the condition of its being allowable—and this altogether apart from the very real danger that the conditional purpose would become an absolute one. For as the fulfilment of the condition is not only impossible but inconceivable, inserting it is quite futile, it cannot be a shield against the sin contemplated, and it is little more than an attempt at self-deception.

If, however, the prohibition of the act has its origin in positive law, human or Divine, or in an irrevocable act of an individual, e.g., a vow, the general opinion is that placing the condition purifies the intention; or at least <sup>2</sup> reduces the malice of it to venial proportions. And even in regard to the law of property, which is partly necessary and partly of free ordinance, it is held that conditioning the desire to steal on a Divine dispensation being given effectually suspends the adhesion of the will and neutralizes the malice of the velleity.

And if the fulfilment of the condition making the act licit depends on the person himself, there is no reason, according to many, why he should not look forward to, and formulate in his *rational* will the desire of, acting in the way supposed, when the prerequisite is realized.<sup>3</sup> Just as to take mental pleasure in an act which was lawful in the past, but which is now unlawful, is not forbidden as such. But, on account of the close correspondence between our higher and lower natures, mental acts are nearly sure to be reproduced in the sensitive faculties; and of course without the conditions or reservations which the intellect can take cognizance of, and which it can use to suspend the consent of the will. The result is accordingly that, especially in certain matters, harbouring mental acts of complacency or desire, even hypothetically, gives rise to actual, and so forbidden, pleasure in the sensitive appetite. For instance, if a person forms the desire of getting the post of public executioner in the case of some criminal who has wronged him personally, there is a danger that the conditional hate in his will would

<sup>1</sup> St. Alphonsus characterises the opposite opinion as *satis probabilis*, on the ground that there is no real adhesion of the will owing to the recognized impossibility of the condition being fulfilled. Op. cit. n. 13.

<sup>2</sup> This qualification is necessary to meet the objection that engaging the will in this way is, at all events, idle and dangerous, or evinces some propensity to evil.

<sup>3</sup> St. Alphonsus, op. cit. nn. 14 and 24.



bring into full play the passion of anger and revenge in his lower nature.

But even apart from this consideration, St. Alphonsus<sup>1</sup> says that the better opinion is that it is a matter for confession if the will takes pleasure in the anticipated experience, or in the past experience, of what is forbidden at present. And for the reason that '*delectatio reddit sibi objectum praesens; et ideo semper ac objectum praesens hic et nunc est malum . . . mala etiam est omnis actualis delectatio.*' However, he adds a little later that, speculatively considered, the act is lawful, '*quo sponsus vult copulam futuram.*' Because this desire in the mind of one entertaining it can be dissociated—though with great difficulty—from actual illicit satisfaction in the object of it.

I need hardly say that, though it is the duty of the confessor to form a judgment—which in the case of internal acts especially will often be only approximate—as to how far his penitents have been guilty of sin or of different kinds of it, he is not bound to be equally precise in his warnings and advice to them. On the contrary, he ought to turn their thoughts and affections not only from sin, but from whatever savours of it, and from the various avenues leading to it; thereby, through the intercession of the Immaculate Mother and St. Joseph, to keep or make them pure in heart and mind, soul and body.

DAVID BARRY.

<sup>1</sup> Loc. cit.

# TWO GREAT PREACHERS OF TRUTH IN THE LAST CENTURY:

LACORDAIRE AND BURKE

By REV. ALBAN KING, O.P., S.T.L.

THERE are many arts in the world that claim our attention and insist on our admiration. There is the art of Painting, that appeals to our eyes, our imagination and our souls. The great works of famous artists have been eagerly gazed upon by millions, throughout many centuries, and have been great factors, not only in delighting the imagination, but also, by filling the intellect with exalted thoughts and mighty truths, as likewise by stirring up in the heart of man those strong and deep feelings that have forced an outlet in noble actions and even in heroic deeds, have been the means of raising humanity to a higher level and to achievements worthy of the marvellous nature with which God has endowed us.

There is the art of Music, that has done so much to cheer and enliven the heart of man amid the dull hours and hard work of life. Nay, by means of the masterpieces of great composers, ably rendered by a capable orchestra and full chorus, music has vied with painting in stirring multitudes to enthusiasm and in stimulating the noblest passions of mankind.

But, far above the arts of Painting, Music, Sculpture and Poetry, as well as above all the other arts, not only in its far reaching effects, but also in its mighty power of swaying great multitudes, of spreading the truth far and wide in the minds of men, and of spurring men on to the realization of the highest aspirations the human heart is capable of, hovers the glorious art of Oratory.

Oratory is one of the greatest incentives to good the world has ever possessed. How often have the persuasive words, poured forth from the lips of an earnest speaker, saved the life of a man? How often has his ringing



eloquence stayed the hand of death, prevented the bloodshed and the devastating effects of war, cast the mantle of peace over the nations, changed the destiny of vast races, won great privileges for the people, stamped the red flag of revolution into the mud and displayed to the admiring gaze of the whole world the rich banner of truth and nobility?

But when the burning words of the orator are winged with Divine Truth and sacred feeling, when they pour forth from the lips of an Ambassador of Christ, and bear a message that should thrill every human heart, when they carry the burden of the most momentous questions that can affect the eternal welfare of the human soul, and sparkle with inspiration from the fullness of the living God, then do they cut and thrust like a two-edged sword; then are they like the piercing hail or the sweeping whirlwind, carrying all before them; then do they captivate the mind, enthrall the heart, and spur the soul on to its utmost endeavour to realize those mighty, sacred and stupendous truths, with a literalness that has electrified the thinking world, raised up the ideals of men to dizzy heights, dealt a fatal blow at the enemies of truth and virtue, and deserved those boundless joys that death cannot kill nor eternity exhaust.

In these few pages there are placed before you two sacred orators, two great preachers of truth, who possessed in the last century, perhaps more than any other preacher, the genius of the spoken word. They represent two nations famous for their eloquence, France and Ireland. It is interesting to place them side by side, for, although both were Dominicans, their lives were dissimilar, as likewise were the great works they accomplished and the effect they produced on the world.

John Baptist Henry Lacordaire was born and baptized on May 12, 1802, at Recey-sur-Ource, in Burgundy, where his father was a village doctor. Four years later death laid his hand upon his father, thus leaving the mother with four sons, of whom Henry was the second. His mother, the daughter of an advocate, was a strong and courageous Christian, who succeeded in instilling a lively faith in her children, and in impressing on their souls her own characteristic quality of masculine strength and decision. Foreshadowing his future vocation, Henry would, even as a child, preach to anyone who would come into his little chapel and listen to him. If no one came, he would say to his nurse: 'Sit down, Collette, the sermon will be long

to-day.' And in fact he would preach with so much force and vehemence that his nurse was sometimes terrified, and would exclaim: 'Oh, Master Henry! that's enough. Don't make yourself so hot.' 'No, No,' he would reply 'people commit too many sins. It is no matter being tired, I could preach for ever.' And when only eight years old, he would use the window as a pulpit and read sermons aloud to the passers-by, imitating the declamation and gestures of preachers he had heard.

At the age of seven, he began his classical studies and three years later entered the Lyceum of Dijon. At first he was made a butt of by his schoolfellows, who pursued him by their brutality. He seems to have been a middling sort of scholar till, in his course of rhetoric, numerous prizes rewarded his labours, while the closing years of his school life were marked by a prodigious success that left a deep impression on his companions.

It is interesting to note here that it was during this period of his life that Lacordaire lost his faith. We have it in his own words:—

I left college at the age of seventeen with my faith destroyed and my morals injured, but upright, open, impetuous, sensible to honour, with a taste for letters and for the beautiful; having before my eyes, as the guiding star of my life, the human ideal of glory. This result is easily explained. Nothing had supported our faith in a system of education in which the Word of God held but a secondary place, and was enforced neither with argument nor eloquence, whilst, at the same time, we were daily engaged in studying the masterpieces and heroic examples of antiquity.

Then he entered the school of law at Dijon. Here, in the discussions held by the students on all the exciting questions then agitating the world, Lacordaire, by his skilful argument, his delicate wit, by his brilliant bursts of eloquence and magnificent outpourings of genius, soon gained the first place among his equals and gave a first glimpse of the future incomparable orator of Notre-Dame.

At the age of twenty he went to Paris and obtained some success at the bar. For two years a great struggle was being fought in his soul between unbelief and faith. It was a long struggle and a stern one, but it ended suddenly, as he tells us in his own words:—

It is indeed a sublime moment when the last ray of light penetrates our souls and attaches to a common centre truths which till then lay



scattered and apart. I seem to see a man who is making his way along as it were by chance and with a bandage over his eyes ; it is a little loosened—he catches a glimpse of the light—and at the moment when the handkerchief falls he stands face to face with the noonday sun.

In 1824 he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, and three years and a half later he was ordained priest.

Nicholas Burke was born on the 8th of September, 1830, twenty-eight years after his great contemporary, in the City of Galway, in Ireland. His father, Walter Burke, was by trade a baker, and occupied a respectable status as a trader, getting contracts for supplying ship biscuits to the maritime service. Once, when Father Burke was asked if he belonged to the aristocratic family of the Burkes of Galway, he replied, 'No, but his father was the best bread man in Galway.' His mother was a Franciscan Tertiary and a strict disciplinarian. The early boyhood of Father Burke seems to have been a chapter of mischief and boyish pranks, and many are the floggings he received from his mother, who, not unmindful of the Wise Man's advice respecting the education of children, evidently looked upon it as a sacred duty. He was educated for some years at Dr. O'Toole's school, and showed himself head and shoulders above his fellow-students in intellectual powers and carried off all the prizes. He was but sixteen years of age when a terrible famine visited Ireland and fearful scenes presented themselves to his gaze ; scenes that he never forgot. He refers to it in one of his sermons, wherein he says : 'The Angel of Famine and Death spread his wings and the baneful shadow passed over the land. I have seen strong men lie down in the streets of the city, and with ashy lips murmur a last cry for food and faint away and die.'—'If I were to live for a thousand years, never could I banish from my memory, or shut out from my eyes, the terrible sights which I then beheld.'

It was at this time that God called him to the Religious Life. One night he heard a sermon which clenched his future career. 'Woe unto me if I do not preach the Gospel of God' rang in his ears for days. At last his final decision was taken to enter the sanctuary and preach Christ crucified, and he presented himself as a postulant for the Dominican Order. He then went to Italy, and on December 29, 1847, received the black and white habit in the old Dominican Convent of Perugia. Three years later he left

Perugia and became a theological student of the Minerva at Rome.

At this time the English Dominican Province had settled at Woodchester under Father Augustine Procter. The Master-General, the famous Père Jandel, sent Brother Thomas Burke, still a student, in 1851, to Woodchester as Novice Master. In 1852 he received the sub-diaconate and diaconate from Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, and in 1853 was ordained priest by the Bishop of Clifton.

Here then we have a short sketch of the lives of these two eminent preachers up to the time of their ordination to the priesthood; the early lives of both being eventful and out of the ordinary, and moreover, although different in character and dissimilar in circumstances, yet full of promise of the eminence to which they attained in after years.

After ordination, Lacordaire became a chaplain to a convent of Visitation nuns, and shortly afterwards became one of the editors of the famous and short-lived journal, *L'Avenir*; while Burke remained on as Novice Master and took his degree of Lector in Sacred Theology, in the church of Woodchester, and then, in 1854, was called to his own Irish Province to found a Novitiate and a House of Studies.

It seems strange that the first sermons of these two great preachers of Truth should have been comparative failures, with little indication of their future prowess in the pulpit. Father Burke's first effort was in the little chapel at Nymphsfield, near Woodchester, when still a deacon. We are told that his eyes remained closed throughout the entire delivery and that he was intensely nervous. So with Lacordaire. His first public sermon in Paris was a failure. The audience, as they went out, shook their heads and said: 'He will never be a preacher.'

It was at Tallaght that the orator in Father Burke began to show itself. He would daily address the novices in fervorinos or homilies which were masterpieces of touching eloquence. But it was in September of 1859, on the occasion of the opening of an organ at St. Mary, Star of the Sea, Sandymount, that this great preacher of Truth first showed the marvellous powers of eloquence he possessed. He was then but twenty-nine and unknown as a preacher, and doubtless great disappointment was felt as this young Friar Preacher ascended the pulpit and faced the audience;



but when, in his rich baritone voice, he began to show the intimate connexion between art and the genius of the Catholic Church, when he allowed his love of music to enter into the depths of his very soul, and then poured it forth in a mighty stream of eloquence, with such richness of imagery, originality of thought and freshness of illustration, all who listened were wrapt in wonder and delight, and left the church with a never-to-be-forgotten sermon in their mind and his praise upon their lips. The next day all Dublin was ringing with the account of his wonderful sermon, whilst its fame soon reached France. And so Father Tom Burke rose in the morning and found himself famous.

Like Burke, though in a more marked way, Lacordaire soon made his name in Paris. At the beginning of 1834 he gave a course of conferences to the students of the College Stanislaus, in their chapel. After the very first day the students had to give up their places to crowds of strangers, who filled the chapel every Sunday for three months in ever increasing numbers. Gentlemen pushed their way in to listen, Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Victor Hugo and others. Lacordaire felt he had found his true vocation at last in apologetic teaching from the pulpit. He wanted to prove the divinity of the Catholic Religion by its effects on society. He felt that his hour had come, that he was master, with his foot on firm ground and sure of victory. Discourse after discourse burst from his enthusiastic soul, full of generous and patriotic emotions, causing the hearts of his hearers to rise and fall like the billows of the ocean, as they listened to the fervid appeals of his eloquence and enthusiasm.

Then it was that the pulpit of Notre-Dame was offered to him, and at the beginning of the Lent of 1835 he commenced those Conferences that have proved one of the greatest and most important religious works of the century. It was the old historic church of Notre-Dame de Paris that was to be the scene of his triumphs, that great cathedral which had been the centre of so many strange historic events. But a little while before, the desecrating Feast of Reason had been celebrated there, and it was only in the year of his birth that Catholic worship had been resumed, and even now the few worshippers that attend the services seemed to be lost in that vast nave. But the old cathedral which had been so long silent and deserted was now to be roused by the noise of a great multitude invading its

precincts. For when it was announced that Lacordaire was to preach, Paris beheld a singular spectacle, as the immense nave of Notre-Dame began to fill from early morning with men of every age, of every form of belief and of every party—with young students of law and of medicine, orators, advocates, men of science, soldiers, republicans, royalists, believers and unbelievers, atheists and materialists, until the old cathedral was packed with dense masses, with a multitude such as had never before been seen within its walls. All the conflicting opinions, all the intellect of Paris, nay of the whole of France, seemed to be there. And they had come to hear the Truth from the lips of a Catholic priest.

A dead silence fell upon those six thousand men of all shades of opinion as Lacordaire, a young man of thirty-three, made his appearance in the pulpit. The orator knew he was on his trial; he had a battle to fight and he had to win. He began in a low voice, that gradually assumed greater fullness as the inspiration of that vast audience began to fill his soul. He looked down upon those who were held captive by errors that had once held him and he burned to deliver them. He identified himself with them, like another St. Paul, saying: 'Are you Frenchmen? So am I. Philosophers? I am one also. Lovers of freedom and independence? I love them both and far more than you.' And as he felt the necessity of grasping that vast audience, and of impressing them with Catholic Truth, his breast dilated, as the noble enthusiasm that filled his soul burst forth in a now historic cry, that reverberated through the arches of the old Cathedral, thrilled each soul and took captive each mind, and will go on echoing through future ages. His hearers were breathless as they listened. They were carried away by the force of his arguments, illustrated by facts of science and history, and made irresistible by his enchanting eloquence. This was his first great triumph; not indeed a fleeting triumph, since, for two years, he held Paris spellbound by his forcible and eloquent exposition of the Truth.

After Lacordaire's first success in the two years' Conferences at Notre-Dame, four years elapsed, during which he determined to join the Dominican Order, wrote his *Memoir for the Re-establishment in France of the Friars-Preachers*, and received the habit of St. Dominic in the church of the Minerva at Rome. In 1840, a year later, he made his profession, and eight days later, on Easter Sunday,



he stirred Rome to its depths by appearing in the pulpit of the Church of the French Nation clothed in the black and white habit of a Friar-Priest, and pouring forth his eloquence over the power of the Resurrection. The audience, roused by his words, felt themselves in the presence of the heroic as they realized the apparition of such a man, in such a garb, in the city of the Popes.

Then three years later he again appeared at Notre-Dame in the habit of a Dominican, and year after year for eight years he held Paris spellbound by his marvellous Conferences. Those were scenes long to be remembered, scenes that live in the world's memory. To have seen Lacordaire in the pulpit of Notre-Dame, his lofty stature, fine and regular features, his classic brow and royal carriage of head, his black and sparkling eyes with their lightning look, the graceful folds of his mantle and vivid gestures ; to have heard that clear incisive voice, susceptible of force and passion, as it rose in power agitating and carrying on the hearers and thrilling them through and through with his ringing living words ; to have realized that there stood a man possessing a splendid intuition of lofty moral truth which is one of the noblest forms of genius the world can boast of, seizing with keen grasp the ideas of Truth, the problems of human nature, growing with his subject, burning with the fire of action, his pent-up emotion, deep and heartfelt, bursting forth as though his soul would break like a tide through the walls of the flesh and cast itself reckless and desperate into the soul of another ; to have been one of that vast congregation, that thronging together of men who could think and understand, men from all quarters, many outside the pale of moral teaching but enquiring after the truth ; to have been among them as he presented to their view a series of brilliant pictures which he called Christianity, when he bade them open their eyes and look—'there was a phenomenon living, palpable, present among men for so many centuries, the Catholic Church was a phenomenon unique on the earth and therefore divine, for if human, it would never have continued to be this one phenomenon, the greatest that has ever been naturalized in the world, the greatest intellectually, the greatest morally, the greatest socially':—yes to have been at those Conferences, not only in Notre-Dame but in every cathedral in France, would have been the most thrilling moment of one's life. It would have forced us to

realize what a magnificent work the Conferences were. It was not merely the conquest of a nation for Christ; it was not merely a people rising up in enthusiasm at the call of a new Prophet, but it was the religion of Jesus Christ, asserting itself in the nineteenth century. No wonder that his soul-stirring words were attended with complete success, that numerous conversions followed, that the tone of journalism and of society improved, that a new energy was given to the clergy and a new and vigorous Catholic life was given to France. Of a truth, the Conferences of Lacordaire form an imposing monument that will keep his name alive for ever.

To return to Father Burke. After his famous sermon on Church Music, he preached frequently, being in demand everywhere. Missions, retreats, and sermons were delivered one after the other, and in one year he preached no less than 760 sermons. One of his great sermons was his oration over the remains of Daniel O'Connell, in the presence of some fifty thousand spectators, a magnificent oration, that lasted for two hours. Another was his panegyric on St. Ignatius, the Founder of the Jesuits.

But the most important and glorious period of his life was the eighteen months he spent in America, during which the country rang with the fame of his eloquence and his name was on the lips of all. When he began to preach in New York his fame spread like wild-fire. Four or five hours before a sermon every place was filled and thousands had to go away disappointed. Invitations poured in upon him from all sides, and in consequence he was soon preaching or lecturing three times a day. His word-painting was wonderful, his dramatic power marvellous, his spontaneous outbursts of eloquence enthralled his audience by a sort of magnetic power; they had to surrender themselves to the sway of his resistless oratory. Indeed his was a triumphal march from church to church, from city to city, capturing the minds and hearts of the vast multitudes he preached to. But his greatest achievement, the crowning glory of his career, was his magnificent refutation of Mr. Froude, a man of brilliant reputation and a consummate master of English style, who had come to appeal to an American jury for a verdict in justification of England's occupation of Ireland and of her administration of the affairs of that country. There was no one in the country to answer him, so Father Burke was put forth, as the champion of his race, to refute



him. The wonderful part is that Father Burke had to answer him off-hand and with scarcely any preparation, and yet he did it so effectually that his audience was fairly carried away with enthusiasm. The thousands who crowded the Academy of Music night after night, while he tore to shreds Froude's indictment against Ireland, will never forget that memorable display of historic lore, of fervid patriotism and unrivalled eloquence. In five lectures, Father Burke ably refuted Mr. Froude and vindicated Ireland's claim to the sympathy of all lovers of freedom. He left America after a stay of eighteen months, during which he delivered four hundred lectures, exclusive of sermons, the proceeds of which amounted to one hundred thousand pounds, and were devoted to relieve churches and convents from debt and to endow charities and hospitals. He was sorry to leave America, as he once said : ' If ever a voice shall tell me to return into your midst it will fall most welcome upon my ears. How joyfully would I lend myself and my labours to the building up in this land of a glorious future for Catholic Irishmen.'

This, then, is but a short and meagre sketch of two great preachers of Truth in the last century, Lacordaire and Burke, both learned, both holy, both eloquent, both having accomplished a great work, both loved and revered by every true Catholic heart.

ALBAN KING, O.P.

# SERMONS AND INSTRUCTIONS ON THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

BY REV. JOSEPH M'CORMACK

THIS paper is not intended to teach the reader how to preach or how to instruct ; its object is to point out what is humbly suggested to be a serious and a common error in the doctrinal portions of sermons and instructions on the Mass.

It is our boast and our glory that a Catholic priest teaches the Faith 'as one having authority.' He gives to the faithful no mere private opinions of his own, but doctrines whose truth is guaranteed by the Infallible Church. Our people realize this. When a priest explains to them some point of doctrine, they understand at once that he is giving them the official teaching of the Church, they take it for granted that he is not merely setting forth an opinion which they would be free to accept or reject as they choose. It is taken for granted that if the priest does, on a rare occasion, express a mere opinion on a point of doctrine, he will warn his hearers that it is only an opinion, that the Church has not spoken on the point ; and his hearers will then know that the statement in question is issued without the Church's seal, and that its acceptance is not obligatory in conscience. This rule, however, is not universally observed in sermons and instructions on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Consequently, it sometimes happens that a preacher or an instructor unconsciously misleads the faithful, giving them the impression that he is teaching the official doctrine of the Church, whereas he is merely giving them the opinion of certain learned men.

It is of Divine Faith that the Mass is a sacrifice—'Si quis dixerit in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non esse aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, anathema sit' (C. Trid., Sess. XXII. Can. 1). There is no room left for varied theological opinions on that point. The Church tells us quite definitely that the



Mass is a true and proper sacrifice, and she relies, for the foundation of her teaching, entirely on Sacred Scripture and Tradition. But the Church does not tell us *how* the Mass is a sacrifice, she does not tell us what a sacrifice is, she does not tell us how the Mass realizes the notion of sacrifice. We have the same sort of thing in the case of many other points of doctrine. The Church, for example, tells us quite plainly that there are three persons in One God, and that Jesus Christ is God and man. She does not tell us how there are three persons in One God, nor how Jesus Christ is both God and man. Similarly the Church tells us that the Mass *is* a sacrifice. She does not tell us *how* the Mass is a sacrifice; she does not tell us *which part* of the Mass constitutes the sacrificial act; she does not tell us *how* any part of the Mass constitutes a sacrificial act. These points (they are quite distinct) are left by the Church for the discussion of theologians.

*The first point.*—In answering the question, ‘Which part of the Mass constitutes the sacrificial act?’ the great majority of theologians point to the consecration. A whole host of names can be quoted in favour of this opinion, v.g., Suarez, Vasquez, Lessius, Arriaga, Gonet, Viva, Billuart, Perrone, etc. It is the view most favoured by modern theologians.

Cardinal Bellarmine, who was a contemporary of Suarez, Vasquez, and Lessius, was not of this opinion. He considered that the consecration and the priest’s communion *together* constituted the act of sacrifice. The great name of Cardinal de Lugo (who lived half a century later than Suarez and his contemporaries, and was therefore in a position to choose between their opinion and that of Cardinal Bellarmine) is also associated with this opinion. He does indeed allow that the consecration would *per se* suffice to constitute the sacrificial act; but he adds.

Cum hoc tamen stat, ipsam sumptionem pertinere ad substantiam et integritatem hujus sacrificii, nam per ipsam adhuc magis consumitur et destruitur victima. Nec repugnat aliquam victimam in eodem sacrificio duplicem destructionem subire; imo in holocausto necesse erat victimam prius occidi postea adhuc magis destrui per totalem combustionem. . . . Quare Bellarminus bene advertit nostrum sacrificium assimilari holocaustis, atque sumptionem correspondere combustioni, sicut consecratio correspondet occisioni—(*De Euchar.*, D. 19, sec. 5, n. 68).

Two centuries later this opinion was strongly taken up by Cardinal Franzelin, who asserts that it is the view of many other theologians (*De Euch.*, Thes. 16).

Considering the great authority attached to these names (St. Alphonsus ranks De Lugo second only to St. Thomas—III. 522), and giving due weight to the arguments by which they support their theory,<sup>1</sup> one could not prudently style this opinion as unsafe.

It would seem indeed that the view pointing to the consecration alone as the sacrificial act is the more probable one; *but it is as yet unsealed and unguaranteed by the Church.* It is nothing more than a theological opinion. Consequently one does not feel inclined to rejoice with Father Pesch, S.J., that ‘in expositionibus catechismi pro populo scriptis haec est unica fere via explicandi sacrificium Missae, e.g., Deharbe, Wilmers, Schmitt, Mohler’ (*De Sac.*, I. Tr. iv. S. 3, Prop. xci. n. 906). A priest is hardly justified in laying down, exclusively, this particular theological opinion as though it were the only possible opinion. Such a procedure is calculated to lead the faithful to think that this opinion is part of the official teaching of the Church and therefore binding in conscience, whereas *the Church has left us free to accept either view.*<sup>2</sup>

*The second point.*—In answering the question, ‘How precisely is the notion of sacrifice realized in the Mass?’ theologians have built up a still greater variety of conflicting opinions. It is more commonly taught that the destruction of the victim is essential for a sacrificial act. As we shall see, this opinion is by no means unanimous. Indeed, even those who do teach it are divided into two great and opposing camps: the one teaching that the

<sup>1</sup> The strongest objection brought by Cardinal Billot against the opinion of De Lugo is ‘quia constitutio rei in statu cibi non habet proportionem ullam cum significatione sacrificiali, sic enim res accomodatur in hominis usum, potiusquam Deo offeratur. . . . Insuper, sacrificium Missae oblatio illa est, quae per varias sacrificiorum, naturae et legis tempore, similitudines figurabatur, ut Tridentinum dicit; unde nefas est supponere rationem oblationis esse sine analogia ulla cum modis offerendi inter homines ab initio usitatis. Atque nunquam legitur sacrificatum animal, formaliter per privationem sensuum aut per reductionem ad comestibile statutum, sed semper hostia viva fuit immolata per nobile genus mortis, quod est sanguinis effusio’ (*De Sac.*, I. Thes. LIV. n. 2). The force of this objection is somewhat weakened by the authority of St. Thomas, who plainly says that animals offered in sacrifice were slain ‘quia veniunt in usum hominis occisa, secundum quod a Deo dantur homini ad esum; et ideo etiam igni cremabantur; quia per ignem decocta fiunt apta humano esui’ (1, 2, Q. 102, a. 3 ad 5).

<sup>2</sup> Of course a priest would be quite justified in urging his people never to miss an opportunity of being present at the consecration of a Mass out of devotion, on the ground that the few minutes would be well spent,—it being *extremely likely* that they would hear Mass during those few minutes.



destruction of the victim is so essential to the notion of sacrifice that the destruction of the Divine Victim must *actually* take place *in* the Mass ; the other teaching that the destruction of the Divine Victim does *not* take place *in* the Mass, but that the destruction of the Divine Victim took place on Calvary, and by its being imaged or represented in the Mass it is shown that the same Victim is now being re-offered in sacrifice.

Now, in the first place, there are theologians of standing who hold that the destruction of the *victim* is not essential for the sacrificial act. This was the view taken by Suarez, who lived from 1548 to 1617. He points out that in the sacrifices of the Old Law the *thing offered* in sacrifice was not always *destroyed*, but was sometimes *produced* by the destruction of something else. He instances the grains of incense destroyed to produce the sweet-smelling smoke which, by its very production, not by its destruction, was offered in sacrifice. He thinks that this (sacrifice by production) takes place in the Mass. The changing of the bread and wine can be looked on as destruction, and by that change Our Lord is produced upon the altar in His office of Victim (Disp. 75, Sect. 5, 6). This view was attacked by his contemporaries, Vasquez, Lessius and De Lugo, who each put forward a new theory of the *ratio sacrificii* of the Mass. Arriaga, who lived from 1592 to 1667, was only a young man when the view of Suarez was being so heavily attacked. He weighed the value of the rival opinions and decided in favour of Suarez. The same decision was arrived at by Viva almost a century later. And in more modern times this theory has found ardent supporters in Scheeben and Schanz—the former contending that this opinion is in conformity with the true mind of the older scholastics, and that the theory which places the *ratio sacrificii* of the Mass in the destruction of the Divine Victim was never brought forward until a date subsequent to the Council of Trent.

Father Van Noort, whilst he is strongly of opinion that the opponents of Suarez are in the right, confesses that he dare not put Suarez' opinion aside as improbable.

Theoriam destructionis sequor non ut certam, sed ut probabiliorem tantum ; minime enim asserere auderem alteram sententiam, quatenus docet etiam aliam immutationem ad rationem sacrificii sufficere posse, probabilitate carere. Porro theoriam destructionis amplectendo, pro explicanda veritate sacrificii Eucharistici conditionem pejorem sectamur ;

nam quod ibi habetur immutatio in melius luce clarius est; quomodo autem intercedat aliqua destructio non ita liquet. Quapropter si ostendimus etiam ex hac difficiliore sententia Eucharistiae nihil deesse eorum quae ad verum sacrificium requiruntur, certe veritatem catholicam efficacissime defendemus—(*Tr. de Sac.*, I. s. iv. c. 8, A. 1, n. 480).

The more common opinion, however, is that destruction of the victim is so essential to the sacrificial act that there can be no sacrifice without it. Now, when this view is applied to the Sacrifice of the Mass we find it interpreted in two conflicting senses—one making the destruction actually take place in the Mass itself, the other making the destruction take place on Calvary.

*The former view* is that of Lessius, who places the destruction in the mystical destruction of the victim realized in the sacramental separation of Our Lord's Body and Blood at the consecration, which sacramental separation would cause death if it were not for concomitance. 'Nec obstat veritati hujus sacrificii quod non fit reipsa separatio sanguinis a carne, quia id est quasi per accidens, propter concomitantiam partium; nam quantum est ex vi verborum, fit vera separatio' (*De perf. Div.*, L. 12, n. 97). Gonet (who was born in 1616 and died in 1681) and Billuart (who was born in 1685 and died in 1757) are supporters of Lessius.

This is also the view of Cardinal de Lugo, who places the destruction in the placing of Our Lord 'in statu decliviori' (*De Euch.*, Disp. 19, Sect. 5, n. 65-67). Cardinal Bellarmine and Cardinal Franzelin have the same theory as De Lugo. This is likewise the view of Cardinal Billot, who places the destruction in the mystical destruction of the Victim realized in the sacramental separation of Our Lord's Body and Blood, not indeed in the sense of Lessius, but 'quia et in quantum sistit Christum sub speciebus sacramenti in quodam externo habitu mortis, ac per hoc nata est, non secus ac realis destructio victimae in propria specie, vere et realiter subiectare symbolicam significationem quae sacrificio propria est' (*De Sacramentis*, I. Thes. LIV. n. 2).

It is to be noted that each of these three bodies of opinion places the destruction of the Divine Victim in the mystical destruction of Our Lord (though they do not agree as to where precisely the mystical destruction lies), and they so place the destruction of the Divine Victim in this mystical destruction that they consider it as corresponding



to the slaughter and burning of the victims in the Old Law.

*The other view*, to which reference has already been made, whilst teaching that there is mystical destruction of the Divine Victim in the Mass does not consider it as corresponding to the destruction of the victims in the Old Law, and points instead to the destruction of the Divine Victim on Calvary.

This was the view of Vasquez, the famous Spanish Jesuit, who was born in 1551 and died in 1604. He does indeed support the view that destruction is necessary for sacrifice. Such destruction must actually take place in the act of offering an absolute sacrifice if it be not at the same time a relative sacrifice also. But when, as in the Mass, the sacrifice is not only absolute but also relative, the destruction need not take place in the actual act of offering the sacrifice. The mystical destruction in the Mass does not realize the notion of destruction. It is merely an image or representation of destruction. The destruction of the Divine Victim took place on Calvary. Hence for Vasquez the *ratio sacrificii* is realized 'quatenus per illam (consecrationem) efficitur ut ipso corpore et sanguine Christi consecrato et realiter ibi contento, cruentum illius sacrificium quod in cruce oblatum est, repraesentetur' (Vasquez in 3 part, D. 222, C. 7). This opinion was supported by Perrone (1794-1876) and others. In our own times we find this view ably expounded by Father Pesch, S.J. :—

Sacrificio praeter significationem theologicam et moralem, sine qua concipi non potest etiam inesse posse significationem mysticam supra jam vidimus. Omne autem sacrificium, cui ea significatio convenit, secundum quam ad repraesentandum aliud sacrificium referatur, recte dicitur sacrificium relativum, cum secundum elementa quae illud intrinsecus constituunt sit sacrificium absolutum. Porro illa relatio ad aliud sacrificium, quamvis non sit de essentia sacrificii in genere, potest tamen ad aliquod sacrificium in specie ita requiri, ut nullam sit sacrificium, si haec relatio absit. Nam qui habet potestatem sacrificium instituendi, et maxime Deus ipse, habet etiam potestatem modum sacrificii ita determinandi, ut observatio hujus modi ad validitatem actus omnino requiratur. Immo potest sacrificium ita institui, ut per ipsam relationem ad aliud sacrificium sit sacrificium absolutum. Nam absolutum sacrificium esse nihil aliud est nisi habere in se elementa essentialia sacrificii et non esse puram imaginem seu repraesentationem alicujus sacrificii praeteriti. Et sic, ut ex dicendis patebit, dicimus missam esse sacrificium absolutum, i.e., verum sacrificium per relationem, quam habet ad sacrificium crucis—(*De Sac.*, VI. Tr. iv. A. 2, n. 886).

And he shows how the Mass has all the essentials for a true sacrifice :—

*Adest hostia, ipse Christus. Adest physica hujus hostiae destructio olim in cruce facta, quae in ordine physico aii quidem praeteriit sed in ordine morali a missae sacrificio est inseparabilis. Adest oblatio sensibilis, quia dum vi verborum corpus Christi ponitur sub una specie et sanguis Christi sub altera specie, habetur mystica mactatio, per quam sensibilibus repraesentatur et offertur physica sanguinis Christi effusio in cruce facta ad Deum colendum et placandum—(Ibid. n. 914).*

In our own day, too, Dr. Coghlan (Professor of Theology at Maynooth) states the position thus :—

In hoc sacrificio panis et vinum non destruuntur. Victima oblata non destruat, realiter aut equivalenter, per modum existendi sacramentalium. Non destruitur communione sacerdotis offerentis. Non satisfaciunt menti sententia de mystica destructione per vim verborum, aut de positione Christi sub speciebus sacramentalibus in quodam externo habitu mortis et destructionis. Sed Christus dicitur immolari quatenus per transubstantiationem ponitur in forma imaginis repraesentativae passionis; non quidem imaginis simplicis, sed imaginis ex opere operato efficacia ad effectus sacrificiales passionis applicandos—(*De S. Euch.*, Q. ix. A. 3).

Perhaps St. Thomas lends his authority to this opinion :—

Sicut dicit August. ad Simplicianum ‘solent imagines earum rerum nominibus appellari, quarum imagines sunt : sicut cum intuentes tabulam, aut parietem pictum dicimus; ille Cicero est, et ille Sallustius.’ Celebratio autem hujus sacramenti imago quaedam est repraesentativa passionis Christi, quae est vera ejus immolatio; et ideo celebratio hujus sacramenti dicitur Christi immolatio (3, Q. 83, a. 1). Repraesentatio Dominicae passionis agitur in ipsa consecratione hujus sacramenti, in qua non debet corpus sine sanguine consecrari (3, Q. 80, a. 12 ad 3). In quantum in hoc sacramento repraesentatur passio Christi, habet rationem sacrificii (3, Q. 79, a. 7).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to say which of the theological explanations of the *ratio sacrificii* in the Mass is the more probable. Perhaps one might venture to assert that the theory of mystical destruction, as realized in the separate consecrations is the view most favoured by modern theologians. The unbiassed critic would hesitate to style it the ‘more probable on the ground of greater authority.’ And, if one considers the grave difficulties which it creates, there is ground for more hesitation still. Its exponents do indeed establish the fact (which nobody would dream of denying) that in the Mass there is an image or representation of the death of Our Lord. But there is no real or actual destruction of the Divine Victim. It would seem to be quite reasonable to urge that in the Mass there is nothing which can be termed destruction in the proper sense of the word. The term ‘destruction’ conveys a definite meaning. If you say that the oxen and sheep (which were slaughtered and burned) were destroyed you will be properly understood. But if you go on to say that *similarly* Our Lord is mystically destroyed in the sacrifice of the Mass you will be using the term destruction in a new and unintelligible sense. What is done to the Divine Victim in the Mass, and what was done to the oxen and sheep in the Old



So far we have seen, that in answering the question as to which part of the Mass constitutes the sacrificial act, we are at liberty to choose between the opinion which points to the consecration alone, and that which points to the consecration together with the communion.

And in answering the question as to how the notion of sacrifice is realized in the Mass, we have a strong body of theological opinion in favour of each of five distinct views. First, that of Suarez, which points to the *changing* of the bread and wine into Our Lord's Body and Blood. Second, that of Lessius, pointing to the *mystical destruction* of the Divine Victim in the sacramental separation of Our Lord's Body and Blood, which separation would take place in reality were it not for concomitance. Third, that of

Law cannot, without some mental gymnastics,—one might almost say subterfuge,—be adequately styled by one and the same term 'destruction.' And who shall blame the faithful if they fail to see how a mere *image* of destruction can take the place of the destruction which is said to be essential to a sacrificial act. From this point of view it is clear that those who follow Suarez and those who follow Vasquez unite in holding that there is *no act in the Mass itself* which can be properly termed the destruction of the Divine Victim, no destruction of the *Victim in the Mass itself* which can be looked upon as supplying the destruction supposed to be required for sacrifice. It should be borne in mind that the Church has never declared that destruction of the victim is essential for a sacrificial act. It rather seems that the Church has deliberately and carefully avoided the use of the term. Hence it is *not certain* that destruction is required as a *sine qua non* for sacrifice. And of course if destruction were not essential, it would be clear to demonstration that a mere image of destruction could by the institution of Our Lord constitute a sacrificial act. It may seem somewhat hazardous to suggest that destruction is not essential, especially in view of the fact that it has been the generally received opinion for so long. Yet if we bear in mind the following facts it does not seem so hazardous to suggest that perhaps after all destruction is not essential for sacrifice, and that in instituting the Sacrifice of the Mass Christ chose a form of oblation other than destruction by which He should be continually offered in sacrifice until the consummation of the world.

The facts to which attention is called are these:—

1. The Church has not declared destruction to be necessary for sacrifice. Moreover, the Church actually abstains from using the term.

2. A large number of theologians are so convinced that there is no destruction of the *Victim in the Mass* that they look for it elsewhere. The destruction they point to (*viz.*, the destruction of the bread and wine in the Mass, or the destruction of Our Lord on Calvary) seems to have no sort of parallel in history. On the other hand, those who do profess to find destruction in the Mass itself are faced with the very grave difficulties referred to above.

3. St. Thomas does not make use of the term destruction in his definition of Sacrifice. 'Sacrificia proprie dicuntur, quando circa res Deo oblatas *aliquid fit*. . . . Et hoc ipsum nomen sonat, nam sacrificium dicitur ex hoc, quod homo facit aliquid sacrum' (2, 2, Q. 85, ad 3). A very wide definition, which would certainly allow an image of destruction to constitute a sacrificial act. It is true that in this place, and in other places also, St. Thomas chooses examples which do as a matter of fact involve destruction. But they are only examples,

De Lugo, which points to the *mystical destruction* of the Divine Victim involved in the *status declivior*. Fourth, that of Cardinal Billot, which points to the *mystical destruction* of the Divine Victim realized in the sacramental separation of Our Lord's Body and Blood, which brings Our Lord upon the altar in the external habit of death. Fifth, that of Vasquez, which points to the real death of Our Lord on Calvary, shown to be re-offered in the Mass by the appearances of death (or mystical death) involved in the separate consecration of Our Lord's Body and Blood.

*None of these views have been rejected by the Church. None have received her seal and guarantee. The writer and his readers are at perfect liberty to adopt any one of these views. The faithful are given the same liberty by the Church.*

In practice, the faithful are frequently denied the use of this liberty which has been left to them by the Church. The preacher or the instructor usually singles out one particular theological opinion (e.g., that of mystical destruction realized

and do not therefore exclude the possibility of finding other examples which do not involve destruction.

4. There are examples of sacrifice in the Old Law which appear to have been offered without destruction.

In regard to the last fact pointed out, one cannot, it is true, be very positive. It may however be safely said that there are cases in which the destruction of the victim is not too evident. Thus we find cases in which the whole victim is offered in sacrifice yet only a portion of it is destroyed. 'And if the sacrifice be from the gridiron the flour shall be tempered with oil, and when thou offerest it to the Lord thou shalt deliver it to the hands of the priest. And when he hath offered it, he shall take a memorial out of the sacrifice and burn it upon the altar. And whatsoever is left shall be Aaron's and his sons', holy of holies of the offerings of the Lord' (Leviticus ii.). Which seems to mean that God has accepted the sacrifice, and has taken part of the sacrifice and given it to Aaron. Still clearer perhaps is the sacrifice of the loaves of proposition, for in their case not even part of the sacrifice is to be destroyed, 'Thou shalt set them six and six one against another upon the most clear table before the Lord. And thou shalt put upon them the clearest frankincense, that the bread may be for a memorial of the oblation of the Lord. Every sabbath they shall be changed before the Lord. And they shall be Aaron's and his sons' that they may eat them in the Holy Place; because it is most holy of the sacrifices of the Lord by a perpetual right' (Levit. xxiv.) It is to be noted that even though incense is to be burned, incense is not the victim. The bread is the victim. And the bread is not destroyed, it is accepted by God as a sacrifice and given to Aaron. Again, one is scarcely compelled by the historical facts, to hold that the emissary goat was looked upon as destroyed, and by destruction offered up in sacrifice. Neither is one compelled to hold that the second sparrow (Levit. xiv.) was regarded as destroyed. Finally, in the sacrifice of Melchisedech, the destruction of the victim (bread and wine) is not clearly vouched for in the Sacred Text. Neither is it clearly excluded. Theologians may reasonably suggest that destruction did take place. But the evidence is in no sense conclusive.

Even though satisfactory theories may be put forward to explain away



in the separate consecration), and sets it insistently before his hearers as though it were the guaranteed teaching of the Church. The writer has heard sermons in which the preacher declared quite definitely, and finally, that it is the mystical destruction of the Divine Victim in the Mass which makes it a sacrifice. Indeed, judging from the treatment given to this question in modern manuals of Christian Doctrine (our Catholic teachers depend, to a great extent, on these manuals), and in collections of 'Sermon Notes' and Sermons (a busy priest is often under the necessity of relying on these), it would seem to be quite the ordinary thing for preacher and teacher to insist without any reservation on this or that one particular theological opinion as though it were the only possible one. Some even appear to 'prove' that the Mass is a sacrifice by means of a theological theory rather than from Sacred Scripture and Tradition—the logical conclusion would be that if this particular theory were wrong (and not being guaranteed by

these cases in which the destruction of the victim is (to say the least) obscure, is there sufficient evidence to conclude decisively that it is a historical fact (not merely a satisfactory theory) that there is no example of sacrifice without the destruction of the victim?

And even though it be assumed as a historical fact that, in the Old Law, destruction of the victim was *de facto* present in every case, one is not therefore compelled to conclude that destruction of the victim must necessarily take place in the Mass. He who ordered the destruction of the victims of the Old Law as the recognized sign of sacrifice, has sufficient authority to ordain that in the sacrifice of the New Law something other than destruction of the Victim shall be the lawfully instituted sign of sacrifice. In the appointment of the *Victim* of the sacrifice of the New Law one sweeping change is certainly brought about. It is this. A Victim unable to be perceived by the senses is substituted for the sensible victims of the Old Law. We do indeed perceive the bread and wine by our senses, but it is only by faith that we perceive the Divine Victim. It would be a less radical change to substitute some other action than the destruction of the victim as the duly authorized sign of sacrifice in the New Law. Or, must we hold that God's authority does not extend so far? Father Pesch seems to think that there is no inherent impossibility in the idea of abolishing destruction as a sign of sacrifice, provided it be done by God's authority. He speaks of some 'immutatio rei' as being essential for sacrifice,—*Utrum hæc immutatio sufficienter adsit per solam moralem consecrationem, an debeat consistere in physica rei destructione sive formali, utest mactatio animalis, sive æquivalenti, ut est effusio vini disputant theologi. Sed Hæc controversia nullo efficaci argumento dirimi potest. Nam si e.g. de Lugo argumentatur, "Alioquin consecratio sacerdotalis vel arae, per quam illa persona vel illa res consecratur et dicatur Deo, esset sacrificium"*—respondent adversarii, "*utique esset sacrificium, si ad hoc esset legitime institutum.*" And he adds, "*Revera difficulter probatur gentiles non habuisse vel non habere illa dona, quæ appendisolerent ad statuas vel in templis idolorum, pro veris sacrificiis. Quidquid igitur est de hac controversia, hoc unum certum est; si Deus aliquod sacrificium instituit, in hoc inveniri omnia elementa ad rationem sacrificia necessaria*" (VI. *De Sacramentis*, Tr. iv. sec. 3, n. 841).

the Church it may be wrong) the Mass would not be a sacrifice. The following examples from approved manuals will demonstrate conclusively the want of reservation in the treatment of the question:—

The victim of a sacrifice must be really or equivalently destroyed to testify that we deserve destruction at God's hand. The Holy Mass acknowledges God's dominion by the mystical destruction of the Victim, represented in the separate consecrations of the bread and wine.<sup>1</sup>

Sacrifice is an external offering of a visible and sensible thing made by a priest to acknowledge by the destruction or change of the thing offered the sovereign power of God. . . . The thing should be destroyed or otherwise changed, because by this destruction or change of the offering we acknowledge the supreme dominion of Almighty God. . . . It is not however required that the thing offered should be really destroyed—it is sufficient to have it mystically destroyed. In the Sacrifice of the Mass the destruction or change of the thing offered takes place. This destruction was really effected on the cross, when the Body and Blood of Jesus had been really separated, but on the altar a mystical separation only takes place, represented by the separate consecration of the two different species of bread and wine.<sup>2</sup>

A sacrifice is the offering of an object by a priest to God alone and the consuming of it to acknowledge that He is the Creator and Lord of all things. . . . In every sacrifice there must be some destruction of the offering . . . it may be physical or equivalent. In the Mass Christ Himself is immolated in an unbloody manner, not only mystically, in as far as the separate consecration of the different elements represent the body and blood of Christ as separated from each other, but also in reality, as the humanity of Christ externally exists as dead under the sacramental species, is as it were turned into nothing, becoming as it does our spiritual food.<sup>3</sup>

To constitute a true sacrifice there must be immolation or destruction of the thing offered, or at least a consecration which changes its nature, its state, or its natural form. In the Mass there is the mystical destruction of the Victim, represented by the separate consecrations, which place Christ on the altar as it were dead. It is the consecration which renders the Victim present on the altar, and puts it in a state of apparent death by the seeming separation of the Body and Blood of Christ from each other.<sup>4</sup>

Sacrifice is offering to God by a lawful minister the destruction or change of some outward thing to acknowledge God's supreme excellence and power over life and death. The destruction or change of the victim is the chief act in the sacrifice. The destroying of life in a sacrifice is called immolation. In the Mass Our Lord suffers mystical death, or is represented as slain by the separate consecration of the bread into the Body of Christ and of the wine into His Blood. If the body were

<sup>1</sup> *The Catechist*, vol. ii. p. 202, by Canon Howe.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. Patrick Power's *Catechism*, vol. iii. p. 259.

<sup>3</sup> *Catholic Theology, or The Catechism Explained*, pp. 392-397, by Rev. D. I. Lanslots, O.S.B.

<sup>4</sup> *Student's Catholic Doctrine*, pp. 298-302, by Charles Hart, B.A.



really separated from the blood it would cause death. The separate consecrations, by seeming to separate Our Lord's Body from His Blood, cause the appearance of death—mystical death.<sup>1</sup>

Sacrifice consists in offering to God a visible object, in order to acknowledge, by its destruction, His supreme dominion over us and all things. . . . In the Mass Jesus Christ is the Victim offered under the appearances of bread and wine, and dies, not a physical, but a mystical death at the communion when the species or appearances of bread are consumed by the priest.<sup>2</sup>

The Mass is a true sacrifice, and as such has all the requisites for the same, namely, a priest, an altar, a victim, and destruction.<sup>3</sup>

Sacrifice has its origin in God's supreme dominion over all the universe which He has made. In acknowledgment of this, the heart of man seeks naturally not only to offer to God its own interior adoration, but also to express that adoration by external signs. Hence the immutation or destruction by the fire, by the knife, and by other means, of animals and inanimate creatures as a mark of man's duty to God. . . . When the Lord Jesus Christ places Himself upon our altars under the separated forms of the bread and wine, it is as true and real a sacrifice as if He bled and died once more. It is not now a physical death, but it is a figurative blood-shedding and a true mystical death.<sup>4</sup>

At the word sacrifice the mind pictures bloody rites and dying victims ; it imagines the knife, the axe, and fire. But there were sacrifices, and true sacrifices, without the shedding of blood. The destruction of lifeless things was, under certain conditions, Sacrifice. What was offered must be destroyed ; not always literally destroyed, but changed, depreciated, smitten, cast forth, banished, or in some sense marked as alienated from man's use, never more to be used by him.

In the Mass Jesus must, therefore, endure some mark, some real change of state, some moral death. Some mystical knife must wound Him. Some humiliation must smite Him, some annihilation, some pouring out, some destruction. Now, look upon the little round of the Host, just consecrated by the word of Christ's minister. That is Jesus Christ. Yes, under that lowly appearance, in that little circle, beneath that poor appearance of common bread. Imprisoned, bound, subject, moved hither and thither,—is He not annihilated ? Is He not slain ? Truly really smitten with the sword of the word, truly slain upon the Altar ?<sup>5</sup>

Quotations might be multiplied indefinitely. But sufficient has been said to show an entire absence of reservation in the statements that '*destruction of the victim is necessary for sacrifice, and that therefore there is and must be destruction of the Victim in the Mass.*' The effect of these books on the teaching given in our schools must obviously

<sup>1</sup> *Doctrine Explanations*, by the Sisters of Notre-Dame, No. 3, pp. 3, 5, 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Sermon Matter*, pp. 137-140, by Rev. T. Girardey, C.S.S.R.

<sup>3</sup> *Pulpit Themes*, p. 425, by Rev. P. A. Beecher.

<sup>4</sup> *A Bishop and His Flock*, p. 123, by John Cuthbert Hedley, Bishop of Newport.

<sup>5</sup> *Our Divine Saviour*, pp. 283-285, by Bishop Hedley.

be considerable. They also have their effect on the sermons preached from our pulpits. Yet it is difficult to find any justification for a priest who, acting as the ambassador of Christ, states without any reservation that without destruction of the victim there can be no sacrifice,—such a statement forms no part of the teaching of the Church, and there are reliable theologians who would consider it false. Father Herbert Lucas, S.J., has well said :—

In view of the divergence of opinions amongst theologians it would seem to be desirable not to lay undue stress upon any of the particular explanations of the *ratio sacrificii* in the Mass, as though if this particular explanation (v.g. that of Vasquez or De Lugo) were mistaken, the *ratio sacrificii* would be lacking . . . it is at least exceedingly doubtful whether we are justified in postulating any second destruction or quasi-destruction or mystical destruction of the Victim, once slain, as an indispensable element in the rite.<sup>1</sup>

The truth of this extract is obvious. If it has a fault it is that it is not sufficiently strong. The *exclusive* stressing of any one of the particular theological theories is in the opinion of the writer something more than undesirable. (Note.—It is not the *theologians* who are at fault, the manuals of *theology* are quite clear and correct ; for they point out definitely what is of Divine Faith and what is only theological opinion. It is the *readers* of manuals of theology and the writers of manuals of Christian Doctrine and Sermon Notes who would seem to be in error.)

In consequence of what has been said above the following suggestions do not seem to be out of place.

Teachers in Catholic schools and training colleges should be told plainly the limits of the Church's definitions in regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass ; that anything beyond those definitions of the Church is merely the opinion of certain learned men who disagree amongst themselves. A warning should be given as to the very misleading character of many of the approved manuals of Christian Doctrine in their treatment of this matter. And if one may say it without presumption, it might be well if professors of theology were to give the same warning to their students.

In actual sermons and instructions the most important

<sup>1</sup> *The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Roman Liturgy*, vol. i. pp. 20, 21. Manresa Press.



part of our teaching ought surely to be that for which we have the guarantee of the Church, viz., that the Mass is a sacrifice, and that the Church says so. We should dwell insistently on the chief basis of the Church's teaching, the words of institution as interpreted by the constant Tradition of the Church. 'This is My Body which is given for you.' 'This is the chalice, the New Testament, in My Blood which shall be shed for you.' From the way Christ spoke and from the words He used the Apostles knew that He had in that moment offered up a new *sacrifice*. He spoke of His Body as being *given for them*—clearly He meant in *Sacrifice*. He spoke of His Blood as being *shed for them*—again, clearly He meant in *Sacrifice*. He spoke of His Blood in the chalice as the *blood of the New Testament* in contradistinction to the blood of the *Old Testament*, i.e., the blood of sacrifice with which Moses sprinkled the people saying, 'This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you' (Exodus xxiv. 8). The blood of sacrifice with which Moses sprinkled the people, the blood of the Old Testament, was the blood of an animal. The blood of sacrifice in the New Testament was to be the blood of Christ Himself. The Apostles were 'to do this in commemoration of Him,' they were to continue to do what He had done, they were to continue to offer up His Blood in sacrifice. They must no longer offer up the sacrifices of the Old Law. Henceforth Christ's Blood, not the blood of an animal, was to be the blood of sacrifice. This was the way in which the Apostles knew the Mass was a sacrifice. This was the way in which the Apostles convinced the world that the Mass was a sacrifice. Should it not be our way too?

Finally, there remains the question of the *ratio sacrificii* in the Mass, the question as to how the Mass realizes the notion of sacrifice. Amongst exceptionally well-instructed Catholics the question might conceivably be gone into at some length and the different theological theories explained. But in the ordinary life of a working priest the opportunities for the giving of such advanced instructions seldom or never present themselves. As a rule the matter should be dealt with in general terms and with very great care to avoid the undue stressing of any one of the different theories. Perhaps a good working text for the purpose would be the definition of sacrifice given in the official English Catechism: 'A sacrifice is the offering of a victim by a priest to God

alone in testimony of His being the sovereign Lord of all things.' A very orthodox and prudent definition. Victim is the key word. Victim is the word to insist on. Just as there was a victim for the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and of Melchisedech, so also there is a Victim in the Sacrifice of the Mass. There *must* be a *victim* for sacrifice. (This is Catholic teaching. The theologians are quite unanimous on that point. They are not unanimous that the victim must be destroyed.)

It is a very easy matter to make the most unlearned person realize what a victim is. A picture of the sacrifice of Abel shown, or a description of some of the sacrifices of the Old Law set forth, and the idea is fixed indelibly. *But not a word should be said about the necessity of the destruction of the victim.* It should only be explained that, as it was necessary for the worshippers to recognize the victim of the sacrifice, a sign was given to them. This sign was, for example, the slaying or the destruction of the victim, or the sprinkling of its blood on the altar. When this sign was given to them the worshippers recognized the victim of the sacrifice, and knew then that the victim was being offered up to God in sacrifice. It is an easy step from this to the Sacrifice of the Mass. In the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Victim is Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ told His Apostles this at the Last Supper. He also told them that they were to use no other victim but Himself in their sacrifices. His Blood, not the blood of sheep and oxen, was to be the blood of sacrifice in the New Testament. And so, on the Catholic altar every day Jesus Christ offers Himself up in sacrifice to His heavenly Father. At the words of consecration pronounced by the priest in Holy Mass, Jesus Christ becomes present on the altar, and not only does He become present but He becomes present there for a special purpose and in a special office. He becomes present with the purpose of offering Himself in sacrifice. He becomes present in His office of Victim. Also, He gives us a *sign* by which the worshippers can recognize not only that He is present on the altar, but that He is present there as a *victim*. He instituted the sign, by which we should recognize Him as a victim, at the Last Supper. The words of consecration are a sign that Christ is there as a victim. His Body becomes present '*to be given for us.*' His Blood becomes present '*to be shed for us.*' His Blood becomes present as the '*blood of the New Testament.*' So in the very words of



consecration Jesus Christ gives us the sign by which we recognize not merely His presence, but His presence *as a Victim to be offered in Sacrifice*.

There are learned men who like to see even more signs still that Our Lord is present on the altar in His office of Victim. Some like to think of the separate consecrations, and how they represent the separation of Our Lord's Body from His Blood, and how it represents the separation of Our Lord's Body and Blood on Calvary. It is as though Christ said to us from the altar, 'You remember how I shed My Body and Blood and offered Myself on Calvary, offered Myself as a Victim in Sacrifice. Now, when you see the appearances of separation of My Body and Blood you have a sign that I am once more a Victim, once more offering Myself up in Sacrifice.' Others like to think of Our Lord, the Great God of heaven and earth, deigning to become present under the lowly appearances of bread and wine, and how this condescension of Our Lord reminds us of His condescension and lowliness in the sacrifice of Calvary. It is as though Christ said to us, 'When you see the lowliness and humiliation of Calvary represented before you in the Mass you will know by that sign that I am once more a Victim, once more offering Myself up in sacrifice.'

Other learned men like to think of the sacrifices of the Old Law which are a type of Calvary and the Mass, and how in many of the old sacrifices the victim was given as food to the priests. It is as though Our Lord said to us, 'You remember how in the Old Law the priests ate of the victim, so also in the Mass you see the priests receiving My Body and Blood as food and drink, and you have in this a sign that I am present in the Mass as a Victim of Sacrifice.' In all of these ways or in any one of these ways we have a sign from Our Lord by which we may know that He is there on the altar in His office of Victim, is really and truly offered in sacrifice. In the Old Law *the sign recognized and authorized by God* was the real death or destruction of the victim. In the Mass *the sign recognized and authorized by God* is the appearances of destruction or death, the representation of Our Lord's death on Calvary.<sup>1</sup>

Such an explanation as this, based on the bare teaching

<sup>1</sup> 'Christus novum instituit pascha, se ipsum ab Ecclesia per sacerdotes *sub signis visibilibus* immo andem in memoriam transitus sui ex hoc mundo ad patrem quando per sui sanguinis effusionem nos redemit eripuitque de potestate tenebrarum et in regnum suum transtulit' (C. Trid. Sess. XXII. c. 1).

of the Church, and omitting all undesirable stress on any particular theological theory, should be insisted on. Although it is so general in its terminology, avoiding all controversial questions, it will convey a far more definite idea and a far more helpful idea (so far as devotional assistance at Mass is concerned) than all the talk in the world about the necessity of destruction and the notion of mystical or equivalent destruction. The only idea conveyed by 'mystical destruction' to most people (theologians apart) is that it is some sort of destruction that they cannot understand. When 'equivalent destruction' is spoken of, one cannot help experiencing a shrinking feeling that it means (in the words of Father Lucas) 'not quite equivalent destruction.' But given the teaching which has been suggested here the faithful will have a definite idea of what the Church teaches and what she does not teach, they will, at the same time, be able to see in a sufficient manner that during the Mass there is something done, that the Mass is a real sacrifice, that Christ is the Victim.

The writer does not claim that the words he has used will suit all classes, old and young. He does claim that the principles set forth will suit, appeal to, and satisfy all classes. He leaves the actual wording of the instruction to the teacher as he leaves the sermon to the preacher.

JOSEPH M'CORMACK.



# THE REFORMATION OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

BY REV. STEPHEN J. ROCHE

THE history of the Catholic Church may be described as a history of continual Reformations. We are tempted sometimes to speak of one so-called Reformation as though it were the chief or the most notable one ; but there are many reformations in the history of the Church, which in their importance can at least come into comparison with that one which we are accustomed to call the 'Reformation.' It is the object of this article to consider one of these reformations, which was fraught with very important results, not only to the Church but to civilization in general—the Reformation, we will call it, of the Thirteenth Century.

A reformation to be a reformation needs three things : firstly, society must be in such a state as to need reforming ; secondly, there must be a man or a body of men raised up to perform the appointed work ; and, thirdly, the work must be a success. We will treat, then, of the Reformation of the Thirteenth Century in this threefold aspect. Society needed reforming. The history of the Church in all ages is alternately the history of the Church affecting the world, and of the Church being affected by the world. The spirit of Christianity was to transform the world. In early times it aimed at doing so from within, but when it became the recognized religion of the Roman Empire, it had to undertake the organization of the Church and the world. As soon as the Church as an organized institution had affected the masses of men, it, in its turn, was affected by them. The worldliness of the laity affected the clergy, simony was practised openly, clerical celibacy was scoffed at, the spiritual power was subjected to the temporal, and in place of the Church being free and unfettered, it became the bond-slave of the State. This state of things did not last for long ; God raised up men to restore His altar again. In the

twelfth century many new Orders arose: the Cluniacs, the Cistercians, the Augustinian Canons, like waves in an advancing tide; each in their turn succeeded in making some little progress before they were swept back into the abyss. For each of these new Orders was able to do something while its inspiration was fresh; but as each gained wealth and power, it fell back into the general condition of the monastic Orders, it lost its vigour and power, it became secularized and of the world worldly. The result was that the beginning of the thirteenth century saw that the beneficent power of the monastic system was at an end, it had its day, but had now outlived itself. Times had changed, people were becoming more enlightened, towns were rising quickly in great numbers, and to the townsman the monk in the cloister was nothing.

The sediment of the town population in the Middle Ages was a dense slough of stagnant misery, squalor, famine, loathsome disease and dull despair, such as the worst slums of Paris, London, or Liverpool know nothing of.

What greatly added to the dreary wretchedness of the lower order in the towns was the fact that the ever-increasing throngs of beggar, outlaw, and ruffian runaways were simply left to shift for themselves. The parish priest could not cope with such a work; the monk kept to his cell and solitude, his nights and days might be spent in praise and prayer, sometimes in study and research, but as for giving active help in battling with the powers of evil, he gave none. Moreover, the monk was by birth and education one with the upper classes. What was the rabble to him? In return, the townsmen hated him cordially as a supercilious aristocrat and pharisee, with the guile and greed of the scribe and lawyer superadded. Side by side with this misery, the times had produced other tendencies which aroused in men's minds dissatisfaction and a contempt for religion. The Crusades had introduced men to a world which they had never known before. Commerce, the result of the Crusades, brought men into closer contact with one another and led to the disseminating of doctrines incompatible with the laws of the Church. The sacrament of marriage among the upper classes was treated with ridicule; the troubadours roamed from place to place, carrying ideas which told of pleasure and the delights of the East, and by this means turned men's minds away from the path of righteousness. To this lawless state



the majority of the clergy offered no resistance. The more learned priests, who saw no way of stopping the growing mischief, contented themselves with indulging in mildly cynical remarks, and even the great St. Bernard could not stop the terrible abuses, he could bring no new spirit, no new organization which might tend to check it.

This great work was left to two Orders which came almost simultaneously into existence in different parts of Europe. It was the work of the Friars, first of all, to give a new life to religion within the Church; secondly, to make a bridge between the new spirit of democracy and the old spirit of autocracy, and lastly, to bring into orderly being the rising civic communities. Society, then, towards the end of the twelfth century needed reforming, but to accomplish this work there was needed men of extraordinary holiness, indefatigable energy, and men with a special call from God. Such men were raised up in the persons of St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi.

Domingo de Guzman, the founder of the Dominican Order, was born at Calaroga, in Spain, in 1170 A.D. He studied at the University of Palencia, and became, in 1199 Canon of Osma, in Castile. When Diego de Azevedo became Bishop of Osma, Domingo or Dominic was chosen to accompany him on an embassy to Denmark. As they journeyed through the south of France, both were struck with horror when they found how few of the people whom they came across professed any belief in the Christian religion at all, and that those who did were almost all heretics of some kind or another. When the embassy to Denmark was over, Diego, with Dominic, hastened to Rome to lay before the Pope the state of things they had discovered, and expressed their wish to combat heresy. The Pope, Innocent III, approved of their design, but would not approve of any new Order. Dominic and Diego again set out for Languedoc in company with thirty Cistercians from Citeaux; they preached in all the churches, and whenever it was possible held disputations with the heretical teachers. But they were without fruit; the rulers took little interest in what they were doing, the Bishops regarded the matter as hopeless, and the ordinary clergy were useless.

A new Order, a new spirit, was needed to renovate the Church, and the time was not far distant. A new Pope was in the Chair of Peter, Honorius III, and in 1217 Dominic lay before the Pontiff his petition for the founding of a new

Order. The Pope would not permit the founding of a new Order, but he allowed Dominic to take any existing rule and adapt it to his purpose. Dominic chose the Rule of St. Augustine, and modelled it to suit his own ends. He replaced the obligation of manual labour for the obligation of study, as the object of his Order was to preach and save souls. The hours of prayer and the obligation of fasting were modified, and copious dispensations could be given by the superiors to any of the brethren engaged in teaching and preaching. Having now gained a sanction for his Rule, Dominic's next object was to gather brethren who should help him in his work. In 1217, when he returned from Rome, he was offered a house at Toulouse, and soon companions began to gather round him, until late in the same year he numbered amongst his followers sixteen. Having got these sixteen brethren, he determined to send them out into all parts to preach. He had three places chiefly in view which he wished to influence—Rome, Paris, and Bologna, the three great centres of university life. The growth of the Order was something remarkable. In Paris it found its abode in the Hospital of St. John, and there it flourished until the days of the Revolution. Three years had now elapsed since its foundation, and its members had spread throughout the greater portion of Europe, conquering the land and renewing the almost dead faith of the ignorant. But Dominic was not alone in his work. God raised up another champion for the revival, one who was to found an Order different from Dominic's, yet heartily collaborating in its work. This was Francis of Assisi.

Francis was born in 1181 A.D. in the little town of Assisi. In his youth he was a mischievous lad, very prodigal of his money and given to peccadillos—on one occasion robbing his father's till that he might have money for his pleasures. In 1202 he became a soldier, and was made a captive in a war against Perugia. During his confinement he pondered much, like the great Ignatius of Loyola, and on his release returned home a changed man. But in 1205 there happened the event known as his conversion, which occurred suddenly, and in an almost grotesque manner. Francis was sent by his father to sell some cloth at the neighbouring town of Foligno. As he was returning from the market with the money in his pocket, it struck him suddenly that this money was mere worthless dross. He returned immediately back to the town and handed his gains over to a priest, who



was about to restore a ruined church. He then asked the priest permission to live with him and this request was granted. His father all this time was in great perplexity over his son, as he could not ascertain his whereabouts. When at last he found him, he put him into confinement and finally delivered him over to the secular power. The magistrates being perplexed how to deal with him, remitted him to the Bishop, who ordered Francis to return the money and to give obedience to his parents. Francis obeyed the commands of the Bishop, restored the money, and then dispossessing himself of all he had, he said, 'Up to this time I called Pietro Bernardin my father, but now I am the servant of God.' From that time Francis broke off all connexion with his family. There is no further mention made of either father or mother in his life. He began a series of wanderings which had not much aim in them. Indeed he did not know what to make of himself. He set himself to building of churches, and with his own hands he rebuilt three: St. Damiano, St. Peter's and Portiuncula. Here, at this latter church, he prayed, and here he founded his Order.

About this time he was joined by one disciple and it was only then that the real object of his life began to dawn on him. He went about as the herald of peace and repentance; many men came, ready to join him, and before the end of the year there were no fewer than eight who were anxious to join him and lead the same sort of life he was leading. It now remained to be answered what were they to do. Francis was the exact opposite of Dominic, who from the first had desired to found an Order and to organize men for a particular purpose. Francis, on the other hand, was troubled when men began to gather round him. When he had at last to draw up some rules for their organization, he simply settled what was to be the mode of life of the brethren, and that in the simplest form. The brethren should give their goods to the poor and live their life in imitation of the Apostles. Francis was now twenty-eight years old, and in 1210, with his eleven disciples, he set out for Rome to lay himself at the feet of the great Pope Innocent III, and to ask from him some formal recognition. The Pontiff, so the story goes, was walking in the gardens of the Lateran when the momentous meeting took place. Startled by the sudden apparition of an emaciated young man, bare-headed, shoeless, half-clad, but, for all his

gentleness, a beggar who would brook no denial, Innocent hesitated—it was but for a brief hour, the next he was won.

Francis returned to Assisi with the Papal sanction for what was, probably, a draft of his afterwards famous Rule. He was met by the whole city, who received him with a frenzy of excitement. By this time his enthusiasm had kindled that of the eleven other men, all now aglow with the same divine fire. All these had surrendered their claim to everything and had resolved to follow their great leader's example of stripping themselves of all worldly possessions and suffering the loss of everything. Their life-work was now to commence. They preached first in Assisi, then, as their numbers increased, Francis sent missionaries to Morocco, Hungary, Spain and France—the learned among their numbers were attracted to the towns, where was a great harvest; the simple remained in their solitude, in prayer for their brethren and for the success of their mission.

We now see, in the year 1220, the two Orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, spread all over Europe, it remains for us now to sketch their arrival in England, their work there, and finally to estimate the success or failure which they achieved. To relate the history of these two Orders in England, from the time of their arrival until the dissolution of the monasteries, would be a task beyond my capacity, and beyond the limits of this paper, but I can at least sketch the objects which the two Orders set themselves to achieve and their *modus operandi*.

The great success which the two Orders were now about to achieve was due to one great cause—the harmony in which they worked together. They both supplemented each other. Dominic had the sense of organization; Francis had a great spirit of zeal. These two great factors, coming from opposite sides, were gradually amalgamated, and consequently produced permanent results.

There was no story more current at the time of their arrival in England than the vision of the chariot with the two steeds. The chariot represented the Church, and the two horses Dominic and Francis, and he who saw the vision heard a voice from heaven which said, 'I have raised up My servant Francis to rebuke the avarice of the clergy, to show the uselessness of riches, to declare the dignity of evangelical poverty. And I have raised up Dominic to be



the steward of My word, a wondrous preacher, a subduer of the hearts of unbelief.' These words describe exactly what contemporaries thought of the two Orders. It was the object of the Franciscan to preach by his life. The Dominican, on the other hand, lived for the purpose of preaching. Living was everything to Francis, practical energy was everything to Dominic. Having now clearly grasped what the idea of both founders was, we will be enabled the more clearly to consider and estimate their work.

What was the state of England at the time of the arrival of the friars? It was in a hopeless state. Dominic was born in the year that Thomas à Becket was murdered in Canterbury Cathedral; Francis in the year that the judgment of God began to fall upon the guilty King and his progeny. Since then everything seemed to have gone wrong. The last six years of Henry II's reign were years of piteous misery, shame, and bitterness. His two elder sons died in arms against their father; the one childless, the other, Godfrey, with a baby boy never destined to arrive at manhood. The two younger ones were Richard and John. History has no story more sad than that of the wretched King, hard at death's door, compelled to submit to the ferocious vindictiveness of the one son, and turning his face to the wall with a broken heart when he discovered the hateful treachery of the other. Ten years after this Richard died childless, and King John was crowned—the falsest and wickedest king that ever sat on the throne of England, and now John himself was dead and Henry III was crowned, a boy just nine years old. For eight years England had lain under an interdict; for most of the time only a single Bishop had remained in England. John had small need to tax his people, he lived on the plunder of bishops and abbots. The churches were desolate, the worship of God in large districts almost came to an end; only in the Cistercian monasteries, and in them only for a time and to a very limited extent, were the rites of religion continued. It was hardly conceivable that the places of those clergy who died during the eight years of the interdict were supplied by fresh ordinations, and some excuse may be found for the demands of the Pope to present to English benefices in the fact that many parishes must have been vacant, and the supply of qualified Englishmen to succeed them had fallen short.

Such, then, was the state of religion in England, when

in 1220 the Dominicans arrived there. They were under the directions of one Gilbert de Fraxineto, who was accompanied by twelve associates. They landed early in August, probably at Dover. They were at once received with cordial approval by Archbishop Langton, who put their powers to the test by commanding one of them to preach before him. On the 10th August they were preaching in London, and on the Feast of the Assumption they settled in Oxford. We hardly hear of their arrival there before we learn that they were well established in their school and were surrounded by eager disciples. They met with a great reception by the townspeople; for, in the quaint language of the time, they 'dived' into the favour of all persons in these parts. They obtained the respect of the learned by their skill in philosophy and divinity, and they gained the love of the Canons of the University by their simple and saint-like carriage. These Dominicans were already the sophists of the age, masters of dialectic methods in vogue, whereby disputation had been raised to the dignity of a science. There a scholar was looked upon as a mere pretender who could not maintain a thesis against all comers before a crowded audience of sharp critics and eager partisans, not too nice in their expressions of dissent or approval. The exercises still kept up for the Doctor's degree in Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge are but the shadows of what was a reality of the past. The aim of the Dominican teachers was to turn out trained preachers furnished with all tricks of dialectic fence and practiced to extempore speaking on the most momentous subjects. Unfortunately the historian, when he had told us of the arrival of the brethren, leaves us in the dark as to all their early struggles and difficulties, and passes on to other matters with which we are not concerned.

The Franciscans, on their arrival two years later, had an easier experience than their brethren, the Dominicans. They were received by the Dominicans at Oxford, and at Canterbury the Master of the Hospital gave them a site, and the citizens built them a little house which they used as a school by day. While the boys were being taught, the poor friars were huddled together in a small room adjoining, and confined as if they had been prisoners. When the scholars went home, the friars crept out, lit a fire and sat round it, and boiled their porridge, and mixed their small beer, sour and thick, as we are told it was, with water



to make it go further, and each contributed some word of edification to the general stock, brought forward some homely illustrations which might serve to brighten the next sermon when it should be preached, or told a pleasant tale, thought out during the day—a story with a moral. Very few, either of the Dominicans or the Franciscans, knew English, and their quaint ways at first brought about a great deal of ridicule. Yet their cheerfulness never deserted them, and to that was due the great popularity they won amongst the common people.

The stories told about them show their exceeding lightheartedness under circumstances of great privation. It is related that some Dominicans, while on a journey, had to take shelter with the Franciscans. There was so little in the house, that one of the Franciscans ran out to beg food for the guests, and returned with a jug of beer. They sat down to table and tried to behave as if it was tolerably furnished, until at last the humour of the situation struck them so forcibly that they all burst out into shouts of laughter to the great astonishment of their Dominican friends. Allied to their simplicity and cheerfulness was the friar's love of philanthropy. Their social work among the poor was something quite unknown before. They managed to get sites given them for their buildings, close to or just outside the city walls. The city was the great barrier in olden days. Inside the city there might be a certain amount of order and cleanliness, but outside the ditch came the marsh and often a pestilential marsh, on which refugees from the country pitched their hut. Outside the city walls at Lynn, York, and Bristol they took up their abode. In a filthy swamp at Norwich, through which the drainage of the city sluggishly trickled into the river, never a foot lower than its banks, they built a monastery.

In a mere barn-like structure, with walls of mud, at Shrewsbury, in the 'Stinking Alley' in London, the Minorites took up their abode, and there they lived, on charity, doing for the lowest the most menial offices, speaking to the poorest words of hope such as the world had not heard for many a day. They lived amongst the people, shared their lives, and did their utmost to alleviate their sorrow. In all instances the poverty of their buildings corresponded with those of the surrounding district. At Canterbury their chapel was erected by a single carpenter in one day.

At Shrewsbury where, owing to the liberality of the townsmen, the dormitory had to be built of stone, the Minister of the Order had them removed and replaced with mud. At Gloucester a friar was deprived of his hood for painting his pulpit and the warden of the same place suffered similar punishment for tolerating pictures. To a special class Francis and his companions devoted their labours. At the time of their arrival in England leprosy was a common disease, loathsome and infectious to the highest degree, it spared none. The medical skill of that age knew no cure. The leper was driven from home and occupation, from family and township; he was disqualified from approaching house or city, deprived of all civil rights. Here was a great and tremendous social evil which set at defiance the skill and philanthropy of the age. The utmost men could do was to banish it, to shut it out, to ignore its existence and close their eyes. But St. Francis was a single-minded man; he adopted those means of grappling with the evil that none but an enthusiast could have taken. He set up leper hospitals and enjoined his friars to live in them. Whoever desired admission into his Order, noble or ignoble, was commanded an attendance on leprous patients. This early attention to sickness and disease developed in the Order those physical studies and pursuits for which they became remarkable. With the friars came the first systematic attention to medical studies, and to natural philosophy in general. There is scarcely a writer of eminence among them, distinguished as he may be for logical and metaphysical ability, who is not equally interested in experimental philosophy. For the first time we hear of physicians entering religious Orders.

John of St. Giles, one of the earliest and most eminent of the Dominicans, was a Professor of Medicine at Paris. Father Crescentius, the seventh Minister-General of the Franciscans, was a physician at Bologna. In Bacon's observations on the eye, it is obvious that he had studied anatomy. From the history of the time we gather that the practice of medicine was absorbed by the friars of the thirteenth century. But their labours extended far beyond the working-classes.

In the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford the Dominicans and Franciscans made their way, and in a very short time exercised a far-reaching influence there. And curious to relate, the Franciscans who, according to the rules of their



founder, should be unlettered, became in time the great advocates of learning and produced greater scholars than the Dominicans. In Oxford the two Orders erected their own buildings and engaged their own lecturers. The first lecturer of the Franciscans was the famous Robert Grosseteste, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln. After him came Adam Marsh, an eminent English theologian. The schools set on foot by the Franciscans produced a great effect on the rest of the University system, an effect not entirely for good. There grew up a sort of rivalry between them and the University, and at Paris this rivalry led to serious quarrels. In England there were many struggles, because the friars, owning no authority but that of the Pope, claimed to settle their own course of education and to have the University degree given to them on their own terms.

The daily life of the friars at the University was very simple. They spent their time in teaching, studying, and, though Hallam implies the contrary, in transcribing manuscripts. The general body of the friars slept, and lived in common. They had no privacy in which to study and their acquisition of learning was accompanied not only by this inconvenience, but in the winter by the absence of warmth and light. The master of the schools and the lector, however, as well as the warden were permitted to have separate chambers and the privacy of the master of the schools and of the lector was at certain times inviolable and later on Wyclif makes it a charge against the mendicants that 'capped' friars that were called Masters of Divinity have their chamber and service as lords and kings. The friars possessed excellent libraries. They were untiring collectors of books, and so enthusiastic were they in this work that Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh, stated before the Pope, in 1257, 'that in the Faculties of Arts, Theology, Canon Law, and, as many assert, Medicine and Civil Law, scarcely a useful book is to be found in the market, but all are bought up by the friars, so that in every convent is a great and noble library, and every one of them who has a recognized position in the Universities (and such are now innumerable) has also a noble library.'

The libraries of the friars were especially rich in the work of their respective Orders, and, taken collectively, must have formed magnificent and complete store-houses of Scholastic Philosophy. The educational work of the friars was not confined to the Universities. Schools were

attached to their convents in other places, but it was especially to Oxford they looked for a continuous stream of professors who had acquired culture and learning there. When Friar William of Nottingham was Provincial of the Grey Friars there were thirty Franciscans who solemnly disputed, and three or four who lectured without disputation in the English province outside the Universities. For he had assigned to the University, students for each convent to succeed to the lecturers on their death or removal. The fame and work of the Franciscan School at Oxford, was not, moreover, merely English. It was European, and friars came there to study from Scotland, Ireland, France, Spain, and Germany.

From the Oxford School teachers were supplied to many of the Franciscan schools in universities and friaries on the Continent, and we find famous lecturers summoned from Oxford to the University of Paris, Lombardy, and Rome itself. Among these were John Wallensis, William of Gainsborough, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus and William of Ockhame. But the friars' work was not limited to academical life. They were also pre-eminent in the ranks of the clergy for their hard work among the people. They visited the poor, preached in and out of their churches, and were constantly ministering to a continuous stream of penitents in the confessional. In all this labour they met with opposition from the beneficed clergy who found their congregation and their fees going to the mendicant friars. The Bishops were loth to license the friars to hear confessions. Out of twenty Franciscans, including such eminent men as John Duns Scotus and Robert Cowton, for whom the episcopal license was asked, only eight received it. The friars, however, were for a long time the best beloved of the people. We gather this from the donations made to them by all classes of people, both high and low. Brewer tells us that scarcely a year elapsed without some mark of this liberality on the part of the individuals or of the community at large. The gifts are small indeed, varying from six pence to forty shillings, but their number and smallness are indicative of the class from whom they were received, and of the popularity of the friars.

At Canterbury the Master of the Priests' Hospital gave the Corporation a piece of ground and a chapel for the use of the friars. At Oxford Richard de Muliner gave the Corporation a house and a piece of ground for their use. At



Cambridge the burgesses received them and assigned them a decayed church near the town jail. At Sirewsbury the King gave the ground, the burgesses the building. In these and other instances the practice existed of investing money, land and buildings for the use of the friars in the Corporations of the towns, and the reason is stated by Eccleston because the friars could not, and would not, possess property.

From these observations we can gather the popularity of the friar. He alone of learned and unlearned possessed some knowledge of foreign countries and their productions. He alone was acquainted with the composition and decomposition of bodies, with the art of distillation, with the construction of machinery, and the use of the laboratory. Undoubtedly, when the Order degenerated, the friar combined with his spiritual functions the occupation of pedlar, huxter, and quack doctor. Thus Chaucer described him 'with his tippet ay farsed full of knyfes and pinnes for to give faire wyves.'

Full well beloved and familiar was he  
 With frankelynes over al in his countres  
 For he had pwer of confession  
 As sayde himself, more than a curate,  
 For of his Order he was licentiat  
 Full swetely herde he confession  
 And pleasant was his absolution.

But a just estimate of the importance of the Order must not be taken from its decline or the representations of its enemies. The monks were jealous of the learning and popularity of the friar, the Bishops hated him because he was exempt from their control, the Lollards regarded him as the bitter champion of the orthodox, as the unscrupulous persecutor of all who dissented from the traditions and teaching of Rome. We must not then be led away by the sarcasm which Chaucer and his equals poured upon the friars, for Chaucer wrote at the end of the fourteenth century, after the Black Death had passed over England, and for that reason we cannot compare the friars of the fourteenth century with that of the thirteenth century. Wadding, the great annalist of the Franciscans, while deploring the notorious decadence in the morale of the Mendicant Orders during the fourteenth century, a decadence which he does not attempt to deny, attributes it wholly to the action of the Black Death; and he is glad

to find in that calamity a sufficient cause for accounting for the loss of the old prestige which, in little more than a century after St. Francis's death, had set in so decidedly.

It was from this course [he writes] that the monastic bodies, and especially the Mendicant Orders, which up to this time had been flourishing in virtue and learning, began to decline and discipline to lax ; as well from the loss of eminent men as from the relaxation of the rules, in consequence of the pitiable calamities of their time, as it was vain to look for reform among the young men and the promiscuous multitude who were received without the necessary discrimination, for they thought more of filling the empty houses than of restoring the old structures that had passed away.

To the Black Death, then, of 1349 must be attributed whatever decadence set in in the rule of the Mendicant Orders, but we must not pass over their labours and sacrifices during that dreadful year of 1349.

We all know of the Plague of London in 1665, and the terrible ravages it wrought. Yet this plague of 1665 did not travel far out of London, its incidence was comparatively trifling. The cholera has visited us again and again, but never on a scale to demoralize the people at large. Only once in our history has the destroyer passed over England, leaving probably no shire unvisited by his awful presence and no parish in which there was not one dead.

So they died ; the Dead were slaying the dying,  
And a famine of strivers silenced strife ;  
There were none to love and none to wed,  
And pity and joy and hope had fled  
And grief had spent her passion in sighing ;  
And where was the Spirit of Life ?

Abbot Gasquet computes that half of the entire population of England was swept away. In Norwich city alone 57,000 died in the year. In the diocese of Norwich 863 incumbents of livings died in the year ; three Archbishops of Canterbury were consecrated and died in the single year. In the two counties of Suffolk and Norfolk, at least nineteen religious houses were left without prior or abbot. We may be quite sure that when the chief ruler dropped off, the brethren of the house and the army of servants and hangers-on did not escape ; out of seven nunneries in these same shires, five of them lost their prioresses. How many nuns were taken off, who can guess ? In the diocese of Ely, where the mortality was less severe than in Norfolk



and Suffolk, fifty-seven priests died in the first three months of the plague. Of the havoc which the plague wrought amongst the friars, it is very difficult to get exact numbers, but, at the General Chapter of Lyons three years later, it was estimated that nearly thirty thousand friars perished during the plague in England and elsewhere. It is one of the consequences of the peculiar privileges granted to the friars that no notice of them occurs in the episcopal records of the time. They were free lances, with whom the Bishop had nothing to do.

We nevertheless find here and there traces of the glorious manner in which they sacrificed their lives for the afflicted. In the house of Our Lady, at Norwich, many friars perished during the plague and their house remained tenantless. At St. Nicholas, Exeter, four friars died within the year. At Pilton Priory two superiors died within a week of each other, and so on; a never-ending list could be given of the havoc the plague wrought amongst the Minorites. Mr. Houlett, in his Preface to the *Monumenta Franciscana*, says, 'it is not disputed that in the awful visitations of the Black Death in the fourteenth century the Franciscan friars in different parts of Europe perished literally by thousands through their devoted attentions to the sick and dying.' It is obvious that a sudden exhaustion of the large reserve of clergy must have made itself felt at once in every parish of England. It now became inevitable that candidates were admitted to Orders with very little reference to their moral and intellectual proficiency. Thus, for example, the illustrious William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, caused one priest whom he was about to ordain to swear upon the Holy Gospel that he would learn within twelve months the Articles of Faith, the cases reserved to the Bishops, the seven works of mercy, the seven mortal or deadly sins, the sacraments of the Church, and the form of administering them and conferring them, as contained in the Constitution of Archbishop Peckham. Some of those who presented themselves for ordination were devout and earnest, others were adventurers, hirelings whose hearts were not in their work.

Ten years after the Black Death the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed deep sorrow at the neglect of Sunday, the desertion of the churches, and the decline in religious observance. A strong reaction had set in against the friars

after the Black Death; this was due to the modification of their rule, and through the loss of the spirit of their founder. It was the new men Chaucer held up to scorn. It was the new men Langland and Wyclif denounced, with a certain amount of justification.

In the social life of medieval England the friar took the all-important part, especially in the formation of Guilds and in the organization of Miracle Plays. The Guilds, as we know, combined the spiritual with the material element, and they enforced the most important moral laws, brought men and women together in a wholesome, civilizing way, acted as beneficent societies and burial clubs, and were the one great stimulant to commercial progress. The case of the Guild of St. Helena, at Beverley, shows exactly what happened. Each year, on the feast of their patron saint, a procession of the Guild went to the church of the Friars Minor. Mass was sung, and every brother and sister offered a penny. At other times there were Masses for the deceased brethren, accompanied by the usual offerings, and if the accounts of the Guild showed a balance at the end of the year, the amount was devoted to the poor and to the maintenance of the Guild Chapel. The object of the Guild, Dr. Brentano says, was the representation of religious plays.

In acting and organizing Miracle Plays the Franciscan friars took a decided lead, and so far was it reckoned in later times one of the recognized callings of the Order, that the Corporation Registers of York tell us that in 1426 William Melton, of the Order of Friars Minor and Professor of Holy Pageantry, and a most famous preacher of the Word of God, made arrangements respecting a Corpus Christi play in that city, evidently as manager of the performance. The more famous 'Plays of Coventry' were wholly in the hands of the Minorites. The plays forming this collection were acted with much state and reverence by 'the Grey Friars,' who had theatres for the several scenes, very large and high, placed upon wheels and drawn to all eminent parts of the city for the better advantage of the citizens. Profit, of course, flowed from these performances, and some will allow and others deny that the labourer in this instance was worthy of his hire; while the question whether these plays were acted for money, or the money received for the sake of having plays, will divide opinion to the end of time.

One thing, however, is certain, that the friar of the



thirteenth, and the early part of the fourteenth, century was the most popular priest in England; of the poor he came, for the poor he laboured.

Those masses, those dreadful masses, crawling, sweltering in the foul hovels, huddling in groups under a dry arch, alive with vermin, lepers by the hundred, too shocking for mothers to gaze at, and therefore driven forth to curse and howl in the lazar house, outside the city walls, there stretching out their long bony hands to clutch the frightened almsgiver's dole—to these St. Francis came, and for these he laboured.

The Rule of St. Francis was a glorious ideal; when it came to be carried into practice by creatures of flesh and blood it proved to be something to dream of, not to live. And yet, even as it was, its effects upon the Church, nay, upon the whole civilized world, were enormous. If, one after another, the Mendicant Orders declined, if their zeal grew cold, their simplicity of life faded, and their discipline relaxed; if they became corrupted by that very world which they promised to purify and deliver from the dominion of Mammon—this is only what has happened again and again, and what must happen as long as men are men. In every age the prophet has always asked for the unattainable, always pointed to a higher level than human nature could breathe in, always insisted on a measure of self-renunciation which saints in their prayers send forth the soul's lame hands to clutch, in their ecstasy of aspiration hope that they may some day arrive at. But, alas! they reach it—never. And yet the saints and the prophet do not live in vain. They send a thrill of noble emotion through the heart of their generation, and the divine tremor does not soon subside. They gather round them the pure and generous, the lofty souls which are not all of the earth earthy. In such, at any rate, a fire is kindled by the spark that has fallen from the altar. By and by it is the fuel that fails; the old fire, after smouldering for a while, goes out, and by no stirring of the dead embers can you make them flame again. You may cry as loudly as you will, 'Pull down the chimney that will not draw, and set another up in its place!' That you may do as you please, another fire you may have, but the new will not be as the old.

# DOCUMENTS

## SOLEMN BEATIFICATION OF VENERABLE OLIVER PLUNKET, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH AND PRIMATE OF IRELAND

(May 23, 1920)

VENERABILI DEI FAMULO OLIVERIO PLUNKET, ARCHIEPISCOPO ARMACANO  
ET HYBERNIAE PRIMATI, MARTYRI, BEATORUM CAELITUM HONORES  
DECERNUNTUR

### BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Ex quo Ecclesia Christi regnum Dei inter homines propagare coepit eorumque fallaciis atque cupiditatibus doctrinam de fide et moribus, sibi divinitus traditam, obicere atque opponere, necesse fuit invidiae flammam, ut Divinus Magister praedixerat, in eam excitari. Unde factum est ut, prioribus christiani aevi saeculis, fideles ex omni aetate, sexu atque ordine civium, ad tormenta et ad mortem ingenti numero rapti, sanguine effuso, inlustre pro divinitate Christi Ecclesiaeque ab ipso instituta testimonium ediderint, idque tam eloquens, tam firmum atque prodigiis tam mirabilibus fultum, ut dei merito licuerit martyrum sanguinem fuisse semen christianorum. Neque, procedente tempore, divina vis atque virtus Ecclesiae eiusmodi caruit testimonio; nunquam enim defuerunt, qui catholicam fidem adorirentur, nec, contra, qui pro Christo et Ecclesia sanguinem et vitam libenter sancteque profunderent. Id quidem septimo decimo saeculo evenisse constat, cum haeresis in Anglia fureret, et rei publicae gubernatores fidei Hybernorum praestantissimae, sub specie civitatis tuendae, insidiarentur, et continentis Hyberniae regiones populosque vastitate, caedibus evertèrent atque excruciant. Quo tempore, cum morum sanctitate et studiosa gregis cura, tum martyrio fortiter facto, divinae Providentiae consilio, Hyberniae Ecclesiae, quae merito Sanctorum insula appellata est, venerabilis Dei Famulus Oliverius Plunket, Archiepiscopus Armacanus et Hyberniae Primas, illuxit. Natus anno reparatae salutis MDCXXIX in oppido *Loughcrew* nuncupato, e nobili ac vestusta gente, et commissus, adhuc puer, Patritio Plunket, tunc abbati sanctae Mariae Dublinensis, postea vero episcopo ecclesiarum Ardachadeniss et Midensis, consanguinei sui curae et diligentiae adeo respondit, ut, prorsus adolescentulus, iam omnibus virtutibus ornatus et a iuvenilibus ludis alienus, insignia pietatis ederet exempla et salutis animarum studio flagraret. Quod vero iam tunc vocari se ad sacra ministeria animadverteret, cum Petro Francisco Scarampo, qui, pontificia functus legatione, anno MDCXLVII



ex Hybernia revertebatur, et quibusdam aliis ex eadem regione adolescentulis, venerabilis Dei famulus, sextum ac decimum aetatis suae annum agens, Romam petiit, et, postquam rhetoricae annum vacavit, in Ludovisianum Hybernorum Conlegium receptus est. Quam optimarum virtutum sedem ita animi ingenique laudibus inde ab initio inlustravit, ut a condiscipulis praeceptoribusque suis tamquam conspicuum religionis, pietatis ac diligentiae exemplar celebraretur. Cum vero perdiligenter philosophiae et theologiae studiis vacasset, pari cum sedulitate canonici civilisque iuris disciplinae in romano athenaeo, quod vulgo *Sapientia* vocabatur, operam dedit. Integritate ac sanctitate morum praeibat sodalibus, cum iisque tam urbane humaniterque agebat ut omnium ad se animos alliceret. Studiorum curriculo absoluto, anno MDCLIV sacerdotio est auctus, sed, ob Cromwellianam catholicorum vexationem, qua impediabatur, quominus in Hyberniam ad sacerdotalia officia explenda reverteretur, moderatorum iussu, Romae aliquot annos moratus est; quo tempore, non modo apud Oratorium sancti Hieronymi a Caritate sacri ministerii munus se dedit et totus erat in caritatis operibus erga proximum exercendis, sed etiam, sacrae theologiae in Conlegio Urbaniano de Propaganda Fide tradendae doctor renuntiatus, officio sibi commisso, cum alumnorum profectu et plausu, perfunctus est. Eodem fere tempore inter Consultores sacrae Congregationis Indicis est cooptatus, et, anno MDCLVIII, ad munus Procuratoris Episcoporum Hyberniae apud Sanctam Sedem obeundum ab iisdem Hyberniae Praesulibus delectus, tam laudabiliter apud Romanam Curiam egit, ut complurium Antistitum admirationem ac benevolentiam sibi conciliaverit, quos inter commemorare placet Benedictum Odescalchi, qui postea, nomine Innocentii XI, hanc summam Petri Cathedram feliciter sanctissimeque tenuit. Quod vero ipsi detulerant munus Hyberniae Episcopi, id innumerabilibus difficultatibus implicabatur ob miseriam in Hybernia rei catholicae condicionem; at viriliter prudenterque Oliverius patriae suae malis ac necessitatibus occurrit, tum efficiendo ut pastores optimi episcopalibus sedibus, perdurante Cromwellii insectatione, viduatis praeficerentur, tum hybernos abalienando a falsis fratribus, qui quandam *Remonstrantiam hybernorum*, pontificiae auctoritati penitus refragantem haereticae lue infectam, vulgandam curabant. Cum autem interea Armachanus Antistes se ab archiepiscopatu abdicasset, fel. rec. Decessor Noster Clemens PP. IX, qui egregias Dei Famuli virtutes noverat eundemque prae ceteris aptum ad episcopatum gerendum habebat, *motu proprio*, anno MDCLXIX, die IX mensis iunii, archiepiscopum Armacanum itemque Hyberniae Primatem elegit. Cuius nuntius electionis mira ab omnibus laetitia exceptus est, et Praesulibus et clero totius Hyberniae pergratus accidit, uti ex gravissimorum eiusdem temporis testium epistolis compertitur. Eodem anno, die mensis novembris tricesimo, Oliverius est Gandavi, in episcopali sacello, ab illius civitatis Antistite, adstante hyberno Praesule Fernensi, episcopus sollemni ritu consecratus; statim vero ac consecrationem accepit, e Belgio primo in Angliam profectus est, postea in Hyberniam, quo mense martio anni MDCLXX tandem pervenit et, dioecesis suae fines ingressus, de pastorali munere rectissime

obeundo sollicitum se summopere ostendit. Neque in Armachana tantummodo Ecclesia regenda et pascenda acquievit, sed ad bonam disciplinam, fere ubique in Hybernia collapsam, instaurandum et clerum ad sanctionis vitae normam revocandum sic proficiebat, ut ad id divinitus vocatus videretur. Plura igitur venerabilis Dei Famulus cum dioecessana tum provincialia concilia multis laboribus vigiliisque parare, summaque prudentia ac sollertia ad felicem exitum perducere; Concilii Oecumenici Tridentini decreta in Hybernia curare promulganda; curas cogitationesque in reverentia Romanae Cathedrae provehenda collocare; monita, mandata, epistolas, documenta cuiusvis generis, quae ad officium pastorale attinerent, incredibili sollertia edere. Quia vero in altissimo munere exercendo nec laboribus pepercit nec pericula metuit, nil mirum si acatholici omnes, et nonnulli etiam ex hybernici mali catholici, piissimo Pastori adversi atque infensissimi fuerunt, eiusque necem anhelantes, nullam insidiam, nullum conatum perdendi hominis praetermittebant. Quapropter, cum anno MDCLXXVIII, simulata ab haereticis catholicorum in regem coniuratione, rursus catholici divexarentur et, novis legibus latis, Episcopi et sacerdotes exilio mularentur, poenis praeterea in eos statutis, qui praestare recusassent iusiurandum quo regem dominum haberent in rebus quoque Fidei, acerrimi Servi Dei inimici facilem hanc occasionem nacti sunt eum perdendi, quamvis ipse, ad haereticos vexatores effugiendos, tutis in recessibus suae dioecesis prudenter lateret. At cum, accepto nuncio infirmitatis Midensis Episcopi, consanguinei sui, caritate permotus, clam Dublinum se contulisset, ut quem adolescens habuerat institutorem, eum inviseret extremisque morientem reficeret sacramentis, praetereaque, cum, eo vita functo, sacris operatus esset atque episcopalem iurisdictionem exercuisset, in ipsum carcerem Dublinensem coniectus est. Unde, septimo post mense, in ius ad urbem *Dundalk* nuncupatam vocatus, cum accusatores ausi non sint palam contra eum testimonium dicere, nullo crimine argui potuit; immo ipsi haeretici iudices eum condemnare noluerunt. Quare antea Dublinum, postea Londinum, contra mores leges regni, ductus, inibi, die III mensis novembris anni MDCLXXX, sub arctiore custodia, in carcere *Newgate*, hieme rigente, est detentus. Die autem III maii et VIII iunii anni MDCLXXXI iudicium Londini iteratum est, in quo, etsi solita iudicialis forma servata est, quoquo tamen modo iustitiae defensionisque iure violata sunt. Iudices enim, odio catholicae Fidei flagrantibus atque Archiepiscopo infensissimis, non modo venerabili Dei Famulo patronum, qui eius causam ageret, atque inducias ad testes ex Hybernia arcessendos denegarunt, verum etiam hostili animo testes quoque ex officio productos subornarunt, virosque iuratos, fraudibus adhibitis excitatoque in religionem odio, ad iniustam prorsus sententiam ferendam impulerunt. Ex ipsius quidem processus tabulis apertissime patet non perduellione vel alio eiusmodi crimine, cum nullo id fundamento veritatis niteretur nullamque veri similitudinem prae se ferret, Famulum Dei reapse condemnatum esse; sed propter episcopalem et primatiales in Hybernia dignitatem Fideique catholicae firmissimam professionem, quam ceterum fictione tantum iuris Anglicani proditionem



vocabant. Morte damnatus die xv mensis iunii anni MDCLXXXI, Dei Servus Deo gratias egit quod martyrio pro Fide coronaretur: et ad crudelissimum supplicium paravit se tranquillo invictoque animo. Ex quibusdam epistolis e carcere datis colligitur quam heroicis animi affectionibus et qua constantia ad patiendum pro Christo intenderet; scribebat enim: 'Fortem servo animum mortis terrore carentem'; 'Cupio dissolvi et esse cum Christo'; 'quod alios in Hybernia hortatus sum verbo, aequum est ut eosdem firmem exemplo.' Ecclesiae refectus Sacramentis e supplicii loco ingentem populi multitudinem allocutus est, omnesque acatholicos quoque commovit, declaravitque sese, perduellionis seu prodicionis culpa vacuum, gratias iudicibus agere, veniam a Deo pro inimicis suis exposcere, catholicam Fidem firmiter constanterque retinere. Calendis iuliis anni MDCLXXXI dirissimum facit martyrium; suspenditur enim vivens adhuc exenteratur, in quatuor partes tandem dissecatur. Post mortem, regis venia, venerabilis Dei Famuli disiecta membra, ut iam ipse exoptaverat, composita sunt in coemeterio sancti Giles Londini; postea vero ad theutonicum coenobium Ordinis sancti Benedicti in *Lambspring* delata, inibi anno MDCXCIII in monumento condita sunt, quod in hypogaeo constructum erat. At corpus in coenobium anglicum benedictinum civitatis *Downside* nuncupatae anno MDCCCLXXXIII translatum est; caput vero iam ab anno MDCCXI Droghedae in Hybernia incorruptum asservabatur apud moniales sancti Dominici. Catholicorum ex Hybernia et Anglia pietas erga venerabilis Dei Famuli reliquias statim exarsit, nec unquam deferbuit: vix enim tertio post anno ab eius morte, rogaverunt liceret lumen incendere ad Servi Dei sepulchrum, et, usque ab anno MDCLXXXIV, Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide hybernis archiepiscopis Casheliensi atque Armacano mandavit ut de causa mortis Famuli Dei rite inquirerent. Cum autem veneratio erga venerabilem Dei Famulum Oliverium Plunket temporis decursu magis magisque percrebresceret, apud sacrorum Rituum Congregationem illius Beatificationis et Canonizationis causa est instituta; absolutisque iis omnibus quae in huiusmodi iudicio erant necessario pertractanda, disceptari coeptum est super martyrio et causa martyrii venerabilis Servi Dei, nec non de signis seu miraculis. Quod, ut rite fieret, die xiv mensis iulii anni MCMXIV Congregatio antepreparatoria, die xix mensis iunii anni MCMXVII Congregatio praeparatoria, et tandem die v mensis februaryi anni MCMXVIII Congregatio generalis habita est, rebusque omnibus acerrimo iudicio investigatis, Nosmetipsi, die xvii mensis martii anni MCMXVIII, edito decreto, de martyrio et causa martyrii venerabilis Dei Famuli Oliverii Plunket constare sollemniter declaravimus ulteriusque proinde in casu procedi posse. Cum vero nihil, secundum sacri fori instituta, iam superesset, nisi ut Patres Cardinales Sacrae Rituum Congregationi praepositi, ceterique de more consulendi rogarentur num tuto procedi posse censerent ad sollemnem venerabilis Servi Dei beatificationem, in generali conventu die xvi mensis aprilis anni MCMXVIII, coram Nobis habito, tum iidem S. R. E. Cardinales, tum qui aderant Praelati et Consultores, unanimi consensu tuto procedi posse responderunt. Nos vero in re tanti momenti Nostram aperire mentem cunctati sumus, ut enixis precibus supernum antea lumen posceremus. Quod quidem cum

fecissemus, Dominico intra Octavam Ascensionis die, idest XII mensis maii eodem anno, religiosissime litato Eucharistico Sacrificio, adstantibus venerabilibus fratribus Nostri Antonio S. R. E. Card. Vico, Episcopo Portuensi et S. Rufinae, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, et Vincentio S. R. E. Card. Vannutelli, Episcopo Ostiensi et Praenestino, Sacri Conlegii Decano causaeque relatore, et Reverendis Dominis Alexandro Verde, eiusdem S. Rituum Congregationis a secretis, et Angelo Mariani, Fidei promotore, sollemniter ediximus tuto procedi posse ad sollemnem venerabilis Servi Dei Oliverii Plunket beatificationem. Quae cum ita sint, precibus permoti venerabilium fratrum Episcoporum Hyberniae et Australasiae, auctoritate Nostra apostolica, concedimus ut idem venerabilis Oliverius Plunket beati nomine in posterum nuncupetur, eiusque corpus et lypsana seu reliquiae publicae venerationi proponantur, non tamen in sollemnibus supplicationibus deferendae; itemque permittimus, ut imagines eiusdem Servi Dei radiis decorentur. Praeterea, eadem auctoritate Nostra, concedimus, ut de eo quotannis recitetur Officium de Communi unius Martyris, cum lectionibus propriis per Nos adprobatis et Missa propria pariter per nos adprobata celebretur, servatis rubricis, dumtaxat tamen in dioecesibus Hyberniae atque Australasiae nec non in Ecclesiis atque Oratoriis Conlegii eliorumque Institutorum Hybernorum in hac Alma Urbe Nostra existentium. Denique largimur ut sollemnia beatificationis venerabilis Dei Famuli Oliverii Plunket, servatis servandis, in dioecesibus supradictis Hyberniae atque Australasiae celebrentur, nec non in templo Conlegii Ludovisiani Hybernorum intra annum ab iisdem sollemnibus in Basilica Vaticana rite peractis. Non obstantibus constitutionibus atque ordinationibus apostolicis ac decretis de non cultu editis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque. Volumus autem ut praesentium Litterarum exemplis, etiam impressis, dummodo manu Secretarii Sacrae Rituum Congregationis subscripta sint et sigillo Cardinalis Praefecti obsignata, eadem prorsus fides in disceptationibus, iudicialibus quoque, habeatur, quae voluntatis Nostrae significationi, hisce Litteris ostensis, haberetur.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub anulo Piscatoris, die XXIII mensis maii, anno MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

**ADDRESS OF THE HOLY FATHER AT THE SEMI-PUBLIC  
CONSISTORY ON THE CANONIZATION OF GABRIEL OF THE  
DOLOROUS VIRGIN, OF MARGARET MARY ALACOQUE, AND  
OF JOAN OF ARC**

(May 7, 1920)

CONSISTORIUM SEMIPUBLICUM DE CANONIZATIONE BB. GABRIELIS A VIRGINE  
PERDOLENTE, MARGARITAE MARIAE ALACOQUE ET IOANNAE DE ARC

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Benedictus Pp. XV, Eminentissimorum Patrum Cardinalium et Reverendissimorum Patriarcharum,



Archiepiscoporum, Episcoporum et Abbatum suffragia excepturus, haec praefatus est.

VENERABILES FRATRES,

Ex iis quae in duobus Consistoriis proximis rite ad vos relata sunt, itemque ex legitimis commentariis quos his diebus pervolutastis, de beato Gabriele a Virgine Perdolente, deque beatis virginibus Margarita Maria Alacoque et Ioanna de Arc, equidem arbitramur nihil iam vobis esse dubii quin ii, quoad terrestre domicilium incoluere, insignibus omnium virtutum eluxerint, cumque hinc ad caelestem patriam evolvissent, iisdem apud Deum deprecatoribus, plura rerum miracula evenerint. Superest igitur ut de augenda consecrandaque eorumdem beatorum caelitem apud Ecclesiam militantem gloria vobiscum hodierno die consultemus. Res sane est magni consilii, utpote quae intimam cum ipsa Fidei sanctitate coniunctionem habeat; agitur enim ut, pro Apostolici magisterii auctoritate, cives ii caelestis Hierusalem a Nobis declarentur, simulque, velut recte vivendi exempla, populo christiano ad imitandum proponantur. Quod si in munero obeundo tam gravi plane Nos Iesu Christi promissio fidesque confirmat, non eo minus optabile est vestram quoque Nobis suffragari prudentiam. Itaque de proposita causa vos singillatim, Venerabiles Fratres, sententiam rogamus.

Exceptis praesentium suffragiis, Beatissimus Pater haec addidit verba:

Idem placere vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, videmus quod Nobismet ipsis, ut hi tres beati caelites in sanctorum numerum, more institutoque huius Apostolicae Sedis, referantur. Certum igitur deliberatumque Nobis est rem propediem ad Sancti Petri in Vaticano peragere, solemnibus caeremoniis: et canonizationi quidem beatorum Gabrielis a Virgine Perdolente et Margaritae Mariae Alacoque diem dicimus huius mensis tertium decimum, sacrum ob memoriam Iesu Christi in caelum ascendentis, beatae vero Ioannae de Arc diem dominicum proxime subsequentem, id est mensis sextum decimum.—Interea vos Nostrae voluntatis propositum supplices commendare Deo, quaesumus, necsesitis.

**THE SOLEMN CANONIZATION OF BLESSED GABRIEL AND  
BLESSED MARGARET MARY IN THE VATICAN BASILICA,  
AND THE HOMILY OF THE HOLY FATHER ON THE  
OCCASION**

(May 13, 1920)

**IN SOLEMNI CANONIZATIONE**

BB. GABRIELIS A VIRGINE PERDOLENTE ET MARGARITAE MARIAE ALACOQUE,  
HABITA IN BASILICA VATICANA, DIE XIII MAII MCMXX, FESTO ASCENSIONIS  
DOMINI.

*Ad triplicem postulationem, instantem, instantius, instantissime, factam  
per Advocatum consistorialem D. Augustum Milani a Viro Eminentissimo*

*Antonio Vico Cardinali, Praefecto S. Rituum Congregationi, Canonizationis Postulatore, Rñus D. Aurelius Galli, Secretarius Litterarum ad Principes, nomine Sanctitatis Suae ita respondit :*

I. Licere sibi nobilissimum par beatorum caelitus summis Ecclesiae honoribus afficere, pergratum sane sanctissimo Domino Nostro perque iucundum contingit. Primum enim prospicit animo secutura communis pietatis incrementa ex aucto eorum cultu et gloria, cum Gabriel quidem, studio Virginis Perdolentis evectus in caelum, ad cordis cruciatus divinae Matris consolandos alliciat, Margarita autem, quae Cordis Iesu alumna existit et ministra peculiaris, ad ipsum penitus cognoscendum et diligendum vehementer invitet. Quod utrumque praeclarae quoque videt esse opportunitatis ad haec tempora, cum humanum genus iis aegrotat ex vulneribus quae Mariae maternam manum et caritatis Iesu medicinam omnino requirant ad sanandum. Omnium siquidem miseriarum quibus nunc publice privatimque laboratur, caput est discessus a Christo : redeundum igitur ad Cor eius et, Maria duce, redeundum, per quam hominibus Salvator illuxit. Accedit quod facultas sibi percipienti datur ut magnam desiderii expectationem expleat Ecclesiae sanctae, cuius lectissimam partem mirifice gaudet in hac loci maiestate praesentem conspicerere. At vero solemnem ritum ingrediens, sedium supernarum assistricem sapientiam eo studiosius, ut par est, implorat ; ob eamque rem, quotquot hic adsunt, universos cupit Deo secum esse supplices, patrocinium adhibentes Mariae Virginis Immaculatae, castissimi Sponsi eius Iosephi, Petri et Pauli, Apostolorum principum, totiusque Curiae caelestis.

II. Paullum etiamnunc morae videtur beatissimo Patri ad solemne decretum pronuntiandum interponere. Interim ab omnibus postulat ut, preces iterando, invocare sibi velint Spiritum Sanctum.

III. Servatis diligenter iis quae, more institutoque huius Apostolicae Sedis, servanda erant, nihil iam esse causae beatissimus Pater autumat, quare decretoriam amplius differat sententiam. Erigite ergo animos ad audiendum, et Petri in Benedicto viventis oraculum excipite.

## HOMILIA SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI

VENERABILES FRATRES, DILECTI FILII,

Triumphalem recolentibus hodierno die reditum Iesu Domini ad Patrem, magna et iustissima nobis, quotquot Liberatorem nostrum diligimus, est causa exsultandi, cum in sublimitate caelestis gloriae constitutam humani generis naturam videamus, et quo Caput Ecclesiae sanctae processerit, eodem corpus venturum non dubitemus. Ab hac vero tanta exsultatione laetitiae minime segreganda est recordatio dominicae Passionis, quando ipse Dominus et crucis, de qua pro nobis pependerit, voluit in sui aeternitate triumpho retinere stigmata, neque aditum in caelos cuiquam post se, nisi via regia crucis, patere permittit. Ad salutiferam autem considerationem Iesu patientis, praeterquam



solemni adscensionis eius memoria, etiam huius diei propria celebritate revocamur, idque praeclaro Dei beneficio, qui cum omnem rerum cursum inscrutabili sapientia gubernat, tum vero de Sanctis suis providentissime disponit, et quo quisque tempore in Ecclesiae bonum oriatur, et quo in terris, postquam ad superos abierit, glorificetur.

Sane, quod Iesus Christus, mandatu Patris, habuit, ante suum in caelos adscensum exsequi opus humanae Redemptionis, sicut ab ineffabili erat Dei erga homines amore profectum, sic, tamquam ad finem, huc spectabat, ut homines ad Deum diligendum inflammaret. Ex ipso enim sanctissimo eius ore, vel potius corde, exiit ea vox, *Sic Deus dilexit mundum, ut Filium suum Unigenitum daret*; itemque *Ignem veni mittere in terram, et quid volo, nisi ut accendatur?* Ergo ex quo aeternus Dei Filius humilitatem nostrae carnis assumpsit, usque dum ad Patris dexteram victor collocavit, omnia in eo quidem plena infinitae caritatis, ut, qui Dominum Nostrum Iesum Christum non amet, anathema eum esse iubeat Apostolus: sed, quoniam maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis, nihil est profecto quod tam spiret amorem tanque ad redamandum alliciat quam Iesus Crucifixus, de quo illud est verissime dictum: ‘vidimus sapientiam amoris nimietate infatuatam.’

Quod si fuit unquam tempus ullum, in quo homines Redemptorem suum negligere viderentur, hoc certe est, cum licet affirmari eos, semperiternae fere salutis immemores, omnes suas curas cogitationesque in terrenis rebus habere defixas. Quare valde laudanda atque efferenda est divina benignitas, cuius providentia nutuque accidit ut aucti duobus caelitibus honores ad Iesu Christi Passionem hodie hominum mentes animosque convertant.

Etenim Margaritae Mariae assignatum munus a Deo, quod sit, apparet: Cordis Iesu omnibus hominibus, quas ipso revelante didicisset, praedicare divitias. Ostendit igitur illa mundo Sacratissimum Cor, at Cruce imposita ornatum ostendit, spinis redimitum vulneratumque lancea, nimirum ut significet visum esse in Passione maxime amore flammescere. Eminent atque exstat in Gabriele singularis erga Virginem Perdolentem pietas, unde et cognomen accepit. Verum hic pietatis affectus cum incredibili Iesu Christi Crucifixi studio cohaeret, ut facile possis dignum Pauli a Cruce filium agnoscere. Sed enim haec duo intimo necessitatis vinculo continentur inter se: cruciatibus Iesu compati et Mariae doloribus. Nam ut Adam primus feminam habuit in praevaricatione sociam, sic alter in salutis nostrae reparatione participem voluit eam, quam de Cruce nostrae reparatione participem voluit eam, quam de Cruce *mulierem* appellando, Evam alteram declaravit, idest Matrem ineffabiliter dolentem omnium hominum, quibus ipse ut vitam acquireret, moriebatur.

His itaque auspiciis quos celebramus, iure expectandum est, ut largior quaedam ex vulneribus Christi per Mariam exsistat iam effusio divinae caritatis. Neque eo minus requiritur vel ad excitandos qui vulgo iacent, christianos spiritus, vel ad reparandas maximorum bonorum iacturas quas fecit, recedens magnam partem a Deo, genus humanum.

Id autem omnibus precibus petat oportet, cuicumque vere cordi est amplificari cum animarum salute regnum Christi. Nos vero, quotquot sumus, quibus semper adhaerere Deo bonum est, in Sanctos novensiles studiose intueamur, eorum et virtutum sequamur exempla et patrocinium imploremus, ut, cum dies nobis aeternitatis illuxerit, et ipsi, eorumdem consortes, regnare possimus cum Christo Iesu, cui sit laus et honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

**THE SOLEMN CANONIZATION OF BLESSED JOAN OF ARC IN  
THE VATICAN BASILICA, AND THE HOMILY OF THE HOLY  
FATHER**

(May 16, 1920)

**IN SOLEMNI CANONIZATIONE**

B. IOANNAE DE ARC, HABITA IN BASILICA VATICANA, DIE XVI MAII MCMXX,  
DOMINICA INFRA OCTAVAM ASCENSIONIS DOMINI

*Ad triplicem postulationem, instantem, instantius, instantissime, factam per Advocatum consistorialem D. Virginium Iacoucci, ab Eminentissimo Viro Antonio Vico, S. R. Congregationi Praefecto, canonizationis Procuratore, Rñus D. Aurelius Galli, Secretarius Litterarum ad Principes, nomine Sanctitatis Suae ita respondit :*

I. Solemnem ritum auspicatur beatissimus Pater summa cum voluntate gratissimoque animo erga Deum, cuius beneficio non solum huius diei faustitatem videt, sed eius celebrandae obtinet ipse principatum. Namque id hodie agitur ut qui constitutus est a Iesu Christo magister veritatis ac iustitiae vindex, fortissimae post hominum memoriam innocentissimaeque virginis consecret immutabili sententia virtutes, maximosque eidem honores decernendo, aeterna simul oblivione iniquae damnationis dedecus obruat. In quo divinae Providentiae licet mirari consilium. Cum enim iniusto iudicio opprimeretur Ioanna, plus semel audita est Romanum appellare Pontificem; et ea quidem appellatio, etsi minime valuit ad crudele supplicium prohibendum, vim tamen et effectum habitura erat opinione maiorem. Ergo, recenti re, Callistus ab omni criminatione Puellae Aurelianensis nomen vindicavit; nunc autem, quinque fere saeculorum intervallo, auctoritate nutuque Dei, beatissimus Dominus noster, in augustissimo orbis terrarum consessu, eam ipsam Puellam exemplar edicit esse sanctitatis, eandemque universitati christianorum proponit ad colendum, ad imitandum. Atque in hac incolarum et hospitum celebritate, praecipue aspectu et praesentia delectatur Galliae, cuius clarissimum civem, qui eius personam publice gerit, frequentesque sacrorum antistites intuetur; nec vero dubitat quin tanta generosae nationis alacritas ad Ioannam de Arc, patriae servatricem honorandam, magnopere futura sit ei salutaris. Interea, ut in re sane maxima, vult omnes qui adsunt, sibi Deum exorent, deprecatoribus adhibendis Maria Deipara Immaculata, Ioseph beatissimo eius Sponso, Petro et Paulo, principibus Apostolorum, ceterisque caelitibus universis.

II. Antequam solemne decretum beatissimus Pater pronuntiet, iudicans



paulo amplius esse in petitione supplicii divini luminis immorandum, enixius invocari iubet, sapientiae auctorem, Spiritum Sanctum.

III. En adest tam diu expectatum bonis horae momentum ut Ioannae de Arc excellens in omni genere virtus Petri auctoritate sanc-  
ciatur. Audiat catholicus orbis, et cuius demirari consuevit fortia facta in salutem patriae, eandem splendidissimum lumen Ecclesiae triumphantis iam nunc veneretur.

### HOMILIA SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI

VENERABILES FRATRES, DILECTI FILII,

Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis, quandoquidem ‘ quae stulta sunt mundi elegit ut confundat sapientes et infirma mundi ut confundat fortia ’ singulare et eximium propriae tum virtutis tum sapientiae specimen nobis exhibet in femina, cuius dum apud homines summis effertur laudibus immortale nomen, Nos hodierno die caelestem gloriam gratulando celebramus. Etenim cum ex iis qui splendore sanctitatis eminent, ut ceteris recte vivendi sint documento, nonnulli maxime in signum et in portentum, quemadmodum Scriptura loquitur, dati videantur Ioannae quidem vita, in illustri quodam flexu saeculorum apparet iis abundans atque affluens gestorum miraculis, quae omnes, quicumque sunt, veritatis amicos ad agnitionem venerationemque divini Auctoris inducant. Nam quod simplex rudisque rerum puellula, arcanæ vocis invitatu, ex timida repente animosior effecta, alacris ad opus aggressa est ex humanis longe difficillimum maximeque arduum; quod quietem paterni ruris laboribus castrorum, et colum atque fusum hasta gladioque secura mutavit; quod, ovicularum assueta custodiae, magnis et bellicosis copiis sollertissime imperitavit, easque ex aliis in alias victorias sine ulla dubitatione rapuit; quod denique regem suum, praeter omnium spem expectationemque, Aurelianensi obsidione soluta, rite consecrandum curavit; quod etiam secreta mentium aperuit, futura praedixit, similia supra naturae vires gessit: haec omnia profecto luce clarius indicant adfuisse hic *Digitum Dei*. Sunt quidem, atque utinam pauci, qui eam secuti sapientiam carnis quam damnat Apostolus,—cum quidquid humanae naturae modulum superat, praeiudicata opinione reiiciant,—haec ipsa admirabilia ita conantur explicare, ut nullo prorsus divino instinctu afflatuque facta esse contendant. Sed ‘ evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis ’: tam certis tamque illustribus monumentis testatae res, si ab illis remotus sit Deus, continuo fiunt quiddam humanae rationi omnino inextricabile.

Quamquam autem de hac honorum celebritate quibus afficitur fortissima civis, iure meritoque Gallia gloriatur, est sane, cui eo magis in virtutum commendatione inclitae filiae triumphet mater Ecclesia: nam, si patriae maxime necessario tempore adfuit Ioanna, verissimeque in eius salutem nata divinitus esse dicitur; at simul exploratissimum est, quaecumque admirabiliter gesserit, omnia eam gessisse, ut Iesu Christi regnum in suis praesertim civibus confirmaret. Neque aliam rem ullam studiosius visa est aut vehementius quaerere, vel cum, caelestem opem

in primis, quodcumque susceptura erat, magnis precibus imploraret, vel cum insigne Crucifixi imagine vexillum sibi ad praeliandum praeferri iuberet, vel cum, ut victrix evaserat, victoriam non sibi, sed rerum omnium arbitro referret acceptam. Accedebat, ut militarem peccandi licentiam in castris suo ipsius conspectu cohiberet, et si quid peccatum esse intellexisset, in fontes severissime animadverteret. Iam quae tam diligens erat ad imperium Dei propagandum, quid mirum si obsequii erga divinam voluntatem ipsa se praeberet exemplum? Id vero, si unquam alias, in huius innocentissimae vitae exitu praeclare patuit. Quam magno, quam forti animo, ut caeleste sibi mandatum munus comprobaret, iniustissimum subiit acerbissimumque supplicium! Flammis iam circa virgineum corpus crepitantibus, Domini sui de cruce pendentis effigiem amantissime deosculata, animam causamque suam in manus eius, cui vitam omnem vixerat, moriens commendavit.

Ecce autem quinque saeculorum interiecto spatio, virtutes Ioannae de Arc, apud sacros Petri cineres, magnificentissime consecrantur, maximique nomini eius decernuntur honores, e quibus elucet illa, quae iam diu apud Dominum in caelis perfruitur, gloria sempiterna. Non id fortuito aut sine consilio accidit hoc tempore, cum homines vulgo nolunt in administrandis rebus publicis regnare super se Christum. Atqui *Oportet illum regnare,—quem (Pater) constituit haeredem universorum, per quem fecit et saecula.*

Itaque hoc 'reges intelligant et erudiantur qui iudicant terram': potentem et imperiosam nationem a summo periculo et discrimine per manum feminae qui liberavit, eum esse cuius arbitrio nutuque omnis humanarum rerum cursus dirigatur. Quando igitur eius voluntati frustra aut certe non impune resistitur, obtemperare et obsequi ne recusent. Nos vero Sanctae Ioannae de Arc et exempla secuti et patrocinio subnixi, omnibus in rebus Iesu Christo Deo mente animoque serviamus, cui servire regnare est nunc et in perpetuum. Amen.

**APOSTOLIC LETTER DECREERING THE BEATIFICATION OF  
THE VENERABLE SERVANTS OF GOD, CHARLES LWANGA,  
MATTHIAS MORUMBA, AND THEIR COMPANIONS, MARTYRS  
OF UGANDA**

(June 6, 1920)

**LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE**

VENERABILIBUS DEI FAMULIS CAROLO LWANGA, MATTHIAE MURUMBA ET  
SOCIIS EORUM, VULGO 'DE UGANDA,' MARTYRIBUS, BEATORUM  
HONORES DECERNUNTUR

**BENEDICTUS PP. XV**

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—In Africam quisnam christianam fidem primus invexerit, disceptatur adhuc; constat tamen, inde ab aevo apostolico religionem ibidem effloruisse ac viguisse, et, quam puram Christifideles Afri vitam agerent, Tertullianus ita describit, ut legentium animos vehementer commoveat. Quae quidem regio nulli cedere videtur



inlustrum virorum martyrumque copia. Ex his vero martyres Scillitanos commemorare placet, qui Carthagine, Publio Vigellio Saturnino proconsole, sanguinem pro Christo profuderunt; e conscriptis autem iudicii quaestionibus, quae hodie quoque feliciter exstant, colligitur qua constantia, quam generosa animi simplicitate proconsuli responderint fidemque suam professi sint. Recolere item libet Potamienas, Perpetuas, Felicitates, Cyprianos et 'multos fratres martyres,' quos Acta generatim percensent; Uticenses praeterea, nomine etiam *Massae Candidae* idcirco nuncupatos, aut quod calce viva obruti sint, ut hymno XIII enarrat Aurelius Prudentius, aut *ob causae fulgorem*, uti Augustinus opinari videtur. Haud ita multo post, primo haeretici, deinde Vandali, postremo mahumetani Africam christianam adeo vastarunt atque everterunt, ut, quae tot inclitos heroas Christo pepererat, quae sedibus episcopalibus plus trecentis gloriabatur et Concilia tam multa fidei disciplinaeque tuendae congregaverat, ea, christiano sensu deleta, paene omnem gradatim exuerit humanitatem et ad barbariam desciverit. Recentiore tamen aetate, quemadmodum non defuerunt qui, scientiae cupiditate incensi, interiores explorare regiones ausi sint, ita, nec minore sane studio, Missionales, spiritibus plene imbuti quibus Apostoli animabantur, nullis armis nisi Cruce instructi, nulla arte nisi invicta in Deum fide confisi, in abditos illos tractus pervaserunt. Eos inter evangelicae sapientiae praecones, honorificentissimum sane obtinent locum Missionarii Africae, qui, *Patres* quoque *Albi* vulgo nuncupati, conditorem patremque legiferum habuerunt fel. rec. Carolum Martialem Lavigerie, primum restitutae Carthaginensis Sedis Archiepiscopum et S. R. E. Cardinalem. Quibus, in ipsis Instituti sui primordiis, id auspiciato contigit, ut, Vicariatu Nili Superioris sibi ab Apostolica Sede commisso, anno MDCCCLXXVIII in Ugandae regnum, in media Africa situm, ingrederentur, ubi, octavo post anno, nigritae duo et viginti, quorum plerique adhuc adulescentes, tam admirabile martyrium fecerunt, ut merito dici queat, eos non modo priscis Africae christianae heroibus aemulatos esse, sed etiam, duplici pudoris et religionis martyrio, suavissimam beatae Agnetis memoriam revocasse. Sed rem praestat ordine exponere, et eventus narratione delibare, qui Ecclesiae Christi gloriam, eandemque ob rerum condiciones novam ac splendidam, peperere. Cum igitur Missionales, quos memoravimus, stationem Sanctae Mariae de Rubaga constituissent et rex Ugandae Mtesa christianae fidei provehendae minime refragaretur, is animorum ardor excitatus est, tot centena catechumenorum se divini verbi satoribus instituendos tradiderunt, ut laetam tota illa regio uberrimorum fructuum spem atque expectationem de se commoveret. Verumtamen, paulo post, rex Mtesa, mahumetanis impulsoribus, qui, si christiana religio plus valuisset, metuebant ne quid mercatura servorum detrimenti caperet, quam libere agere consueverant, commutata sensim voluntate atque opinione, id animo denique intendit, ut fidei propagationi, vi quoque illata, si opus esset, obsisteret. Qua rerum condicione prudenter perpensa, missionales interim cessare loco; sed cum, brevi post, rex vita functus esset, Muanga eius filius, quo familiari ac benevolo utebantur, vix regno potitus, iis institit, ut in urbem principem regrederentur. Idem vero, cum reversos benigne excepisset,

palam sponndit, quandoquidem in patris locum, Deo christianorum precibus conciliato, suffectus erat, fore ut non modo ex hisce optimos ad se arcesseret atque ad regni dignitates eveheret, sed etiam ethnicos omnes imperio suo obnoxios ad religionem amplectendam ipsemet incitaret. Iussit sane complures ex christianis vel catechumenis in regia aula circumsistere, et quidem non sine sua ipsius utilitate; cum enim optimates, rebus novis adversi, de rege interimendo clam decrevisent, nonnulli ex christianis aulicis, re cognita, Muanga occulte monuerunt ut sibi caveret, addideruntque, posse ipsum, cum christianis omnibus, tum hominibus qui in eorum ditione essent, idest duobus armatorum millibus, plene confidere. Primus interea regis administer, idemque praecipuus coniurationis auctor, etsi veniam sibi sociisque a Muanga impetravit, vehementiore tamen, quam antea, odio in christianos exarsit; quid, quod audivit, se magistratu destituendum, et in sui locum Iosephum Mkasa, christianum, subrogatum iri? Itaque, omnes nactus occasiones, insusurrare ille regi, qui Christi religionem profiterentur, eos capitales hostes habendos esse; fidem regi utique servaturos, donec parvo essent numero; at, si quando ceteris numero praestitissent, eum de medio sublaturus ut aliquem e suis ad regiam dignitatem proveherent. Sed alia huc accessit, eaque potior, invidiae caussa, qua rex Muanga ad christianos insectandos impelleretur; cum enim, detestabili mahumetanorum opera, vitiis contra naturam indulgere coepisset, quod conatus omni contentione est, id nunquam consequi potuit, ut christiani ex aula regia pueri morem sibi gererent. Ita, quod religioni in honorem verti debuit, facessivit religioni periculum. Ventum denique est ad caedes, et Muanga primo administro denuntiavit, velle se omnibus qui orarent mortem inferri: qua pulcherrima verborum figura nostri designabantur. Quot hac in persecutione hostiae Deo gratae immolatae sint, haud satis constat; inlustre vero prae ceteris fecere martyrium, uti ante diximus, nigritae duo et viginti, quos, pro mortis genere, in duo agmina distinguere iuvat; alterum eorum, numero tredecim, qui vivi combusti; alterum eorum, numero novem, qui verio suppliciorum genere interempti sunt. E priore agmine, aulici seu pueri fere omnes, sunt Carolus Lwanga, Mbagá Tuzindé, Bruno Séron Kuma, Iacobus Buzabaliao, Kizito, Ambrosius Kibuka, Mgagga, Gyavira, Achilles Kiwanuka, Adolphus Ludigo Mkasa, Mukasa Kiriwanvu, Anatolius Kiriggwajjo, Lucas Banabakintu.—Carolus Lwanga, in oppido Bulimu ortus et die xv mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV baptismo ablutus, ob egregias animi laudes omnium admirationem ac benevolentiam sibi conciliavit; quem Muanga ipse magni habebat, quod munera a se commissa perdiligenter expleret. Cum autem pueris regiis praeesset, eos ad fidem et castitatem servandam, contemptis impii atque impudici regis illecebris, confirmavit; vinculis constrictus, catechumenos quoque, ut in religionis studio preseverarent, palam hortatus est et ad supplicii locum admirabili animi fortitudine contendit, cum annum ageret vicesimum.—Mbagá Tuzindé, puer regius, filius Mkadjanga, praecipui et crudelissimi ex carnificibus, adhuc catechumenus cum persecutio exarsit, a Carolo Lwanga paulo ante communem condemnationem baptismo ablutus est. Quem pater cum quoquo



pacto a morte eripere vallet, iterum iterumque deprecatus est, ut religionem catholicam eiuraret, aut saltem se abdi pateretur et promitteret se orare desitutum. Verum magnanimus adulescens respondit, se caussam mortis suae nosse et probare, regis autem iram in patrem conflare nolle : rogavit, ne sibi parceretur. Tunc Mkadjanga, ut filium, vix annorum sedecim, ignis cruciatibus subduceret, uni ex minoribus carnificibus imperavit, ut caput eius fuste percuteret et examine corpus igni tradendum cum aliis componeret.—Bruno Séron Kuma, in pago Mbalé natus et die xv mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV baptizatus, a fratris sui contubernio discessit quod hic acatholicam sectam sequeretur. Regi Mtesa famulatus, postquam Muanga parit successit officium abdicavit ut stipendia mereret. Cum christianis aulicis comprehensus, sex et viginti annos natus, verbo atque exemplo gloriosi certaminis socios roboravit.—Iacobus Buzabaliao, die xv mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV baptismi aquis ablutus, singulari religionis provehendae studio incensus, alios, ipsumque Muanga, nondum in paterno solio collocatum, ad Christi fidem amplexandam allicere atque excitare omni ope nixus est ; id ipsum rex fortissimo iuveni exprobravit, cum eum, viginti annos natum, occidi iussit.—Kizito, candidula anima, ceteris iunior, utpote qui aetatis suae anno tertio decimo martyrium fecerit, filius unius e regni proceribus et innocentia ac firmitate animi praeclarus, paulo ante quam in vincula coniectus est, a Carolo Lwanga baptismum accepit. Fortissimum puerum libidinosus rex, acrius quam ceteros, frustra ad se pellexit. Quosdam vero christianos, quod fugam ceperant, Kizito ita obiurgavit, ut ii se regi Muanga, metu deposito, stiterint ; et cum in eo esset ut ad supplicium duceretur, sociis, ne quis animo deficeret, auctor fuit ut coniunctis inter se manibus omnes simul procederent.—Ambrosius Kibuka, ipse quoque ex aulicis, die xvii mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV baptismo tinctus, fidem ardentem constanterque retinuit ad atrocissimam usque necem, quam pro Christo oppetiit annos natus duodeviginti.—Mgagga, puer regius, adhuc catechumenus, regi obscena suadenti fortiter restitit, et, se christianum professus, cum aliis in carcerem coniectus est : ante quam detineretur, a Carolo Lwanga baptismum accepit, et, haud secus ac ceteri, martyrium tranquillo animo fecit, anno aetatis suae sexto decimo.—Gyavira, ex iisdem aulicis, pulcher adspectu, a rege Muanga diligebatur, qui tamen nequiquam eum ad explendam secum libidinem illexit. Catechumenus adhuc cum, post fidei professionem, a Muanga morte damnatus est, noctu a Carolo Lwanga baptismo tinctus et cum ceteris ad supplicii locum, annos natus septemdecim, a carnificibus deductus est.—Achilles Kiwanuka, puer regius, Mitiyanae natus, die xvii mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV baptizatus est. Postquam firmo animo fidem suam coram rege confessus est, cum sociis catena vinctus et in carcerem contrusus, denuo asseveravit se nunquam a catholica religione desciturum et ad ultimum supplicium progressus strenue est, anno aetatis suae decimo septimo.—Adulphus Ludigo Mkasa, aulicus, morum integritate itemque assiduitate patientiaque laborum enituit. Baptismo die xvii mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV suscepto, catholicam fidem, cum sancte retinuit, tum constanter cum ceteris professus est ad mortem usque,

quam, annos natus quinque ac viginti, pro Christo pertulit.—Mukasa Kiriwanu, puer regius cibariis in aula partiendis, cum carnifices Carolum Lwanga eiusque socios ad collem Namugongo perducerent, rogatus num christianus esset, affirmavit, et cum aliis ad supplicium raptus est. Catechumenus nondum baptismum fluminis adeptus, baptismo sanguinis, annos duodeviginti natus, aeternam gloriam consecutus est.—Anatolius Kiriggwajjo, regius puer, die xvii mensis novembris anno mdccclxxxv baptismo ablutus, christianae vitae praecepta ea animi firmitate retinuit, ut oblatam sibi a rege dignitatem, quae aeternae saluti aliquid detrimenti afferre posse videbatur, sine cunctatione respuerit. Catholicam vero fidem cum ceteris aperte professus, communem cum iisdem mortem oppetiit sexto decimo aetatis anno.—Postremum ex hoc agmine recensemus Lucam Banabakintu, qui, in pago Ntlomo natus, optimati cuidam, Mukwenda nomine, perdiligenter famulabatur. Die xxviii mensis maii anno mdccclxxxii, cum baptismo et confirmatione donatus est, tum ad sacram synaxim primum accessit: quo faustissimo ex die, integritate morum praeceptorumque observatione ceteris in exemplum praeluxit, et nihil habuit antiquius quam ut de divinis rebus cum amicis colloqueretur. Is, cum mortem facile effugere posset, maluit, ad necem conquisitus, se domino sistere, a quo hominibus a rege missis traditus est. In carcerem detrusus, laetissimo ibi animo degit, donec cum ceteris, tricesimum agens annum, pro Christo vitam profudit.—Hi omnes, quos nominavimus, die iii mensis iunii anno mdccclxxxvi, orto iam sole, ad collem Namugongo feruntur. Quo cum pervenissent, manibus post tergum devinctis pedibusque colligatis, crate unusquisque eorum involvitur arundinibus texta; rogos struitur, in quem fascies eiusmodi humani imponuntur. Admoto pedibus igni, ut grex ille immolatorum tener lentius ac diutius torqueretur, crepitare flamma, quae sanctis corporibus aleretur; e rogo murmura precum in aëra diffundi et pro vi cruciatuum crebrescere; mirari carnifices, non questum, non gemitum a morientibus fieri, quorum similes adhuc nullos sibi videre contigisset. Sic castissimos fortissimosque heroas ignis unus omnes simul consumpsit, una patria simul omnes caelestibus sedibus excepit.—In altero novem nigritarum agmine numerantur venerabiles Dei servi Matthias Kalembe Murumba, Athanasius Badzekuketta, Pontianus Ngondwé, Gonzaga Gonza, Andreas Kagwa, Noë Mawgalli, Iosephus Mkasa Balikuddembé, Ioannes Maria Muzéi (Iamari), Dionysius Sebuggwao.—Matthias Kalembe Murumba quinquagesimum agebat annum cum martyrium fecit. Ad munus iudicis delectus, cum ex mahumetana ac protestantica secta ad catholicam religionem transisset, baptismo die xxviii mensis maii anno mdccclxxxii suscepto, veritus ne cui, iure dicendo, iniuriam inferret, se officio abdicavit. Modestia ac lenitate animi praeditus, religionis propagandae studio sic erat incensus, ut non modo liberos suos ad sancte vivendum instituerit, sed quoscumque potuit, christianam doctrinam docuerit. Primus regis administer, coram quo productus est, gravissimo homini, fidem animose professo, iussit manus pedesque praecidi, et carnis fragmenta e tergo evelli, ante oculos eius adurenda. Carnifices igitur in collem incultum ac desertum, ne a spectatoribus in atrocissimo officio



fungendo perturbarentur, venerabilem Dei famulum, alacrem laetitiaque gestientem, abducunt; iussa ad unguem perficiunt; ut inclitus martyr diutius cruciaretur, ea arte sanguinem ex artubus fluentem coërun, ut, triduo post, servi quidam, illuc ad recidendas arundines coëuntes, languidam ac remissam vocem audierint Matthiae aquae haustum poscentis; quem cum tam foede detruncatum conspexissent, territi inde aufugiunt et Christi morientis imitatorem omni destitutum solacio relinquunt.—Athanasius Badzekuketta, inter regiae domus adulescentes adlectus et die xvii mensis novembris anno mdccclxxxv baptismo ablutus, perdiligenter Dei Ecclesiaeque praecepta exsequebatur. Ita vero martyrii desiderio flagrabat, ut carnifices, a quibus et d statum locum aliis perducebatur, impense rogaverit ut se ilico caederent. Itaque strenuus adulescens, die xxvi mensis maii anno mdccclxxxvi, aetatis suae duodevicesimo, iteratis ictibus dilaniatus est.—Pontianus Ngondwé, in vico Bulimu ortus et regis Mtesa aulicus, Muanga in huius locum suffecto, stipendia meruit et, catechumenus adhuc, christianis spiritibus adeo animatus apparuit, ut asperum ac morosum ingenium, sui victor, commutaverit. Persecutione autem instante, baptismum die xviii mensis novembris anno mdccclxxxv suscepit: quare, haud ita multo post, in carcerem cum aliis coniectus est. Cum vero carnifex Mkadjanga, a quo, supplicio mulctandus, ad collem Namugongo ducebatur, eum in itinere iterato rogasset num christianam religionem sectaretur, bis affirmantem, bis lancea confodit, abscissumque eius caput in viam proiecit, die xxvi mensis maii anno mdccclxxxvi.—Gonzaga Gonza, regius puer, die xvii mensis novembris anno mdccclxxxv baptizatus, religionis officia sedulo explevit et caritatis virtute praecipue enituit. Qui cum ad supplicii locum progrediretur et compedibus, quae distrahi nequiverant, impediretur, quominus pleno gradu incederet, a carnificibus iterum iterumque lancea traiectus, martyrium fecit, die xxvii mensis maii anno mdccclxxxvi, aetatis suae duodevicesimo.—Andreas Kagwa, in oppido Bunyoro natus et Muanga cum principe tum rege usus familiarissimo, die xxx mensis aprillis anno mdccclxxxii baptismi, confirmationis et Eucharistiae sacramenta percepit. Ob egregias animi laudes omnibus carus, non modo quotquot se adibant, ad christianam sapientiam informabat, sed etiam, cum olim pestis regionem invasisset, omnibus omnia factus, singulari infirmos caritate complexus est, satis multos, aquis baptismi ablutos, Christo peperit et vita functos sepultura affecit. Cum vero primus regis administer molestissime ferret, liberos suos ab eo christiana imbui doctrina, rege tandem consentiente, eum comprehendi et occidi iussit, addens, se non ante cenaturum quam carnifex praecisam Andreae demortui manum ad se attulisset. Ita, die xxvi mensis maii anno mdccclxxxvi, aetatis suae tricesimo, venerabilis Dei famulus ad caelestia gaudia, martyrio facto, convolvit.—Noë Mawgalli, proceris Mukwenda famulus vasis escariis conficiendis, virtutum christianarum laude magnopere floruit. Calendis novembribus anno mdccclxxxv baptismo ablutus, ab hominibus, quos rex Muanga ad diripiendas Christifidelium domos circummiserat, lancea confossus, occubuit die xxxi mensis maii anno mdccclxxxvi, aetatis suae tricesimo.—Iosephus Mkasa Balikuddembé,

natus in pago Buwama, ob spectatam fidem a rege Mtesa delectus est, qui ei diu noctuque inserviret atque aegrotanti mederetur. Eius filius Muanga, haud secus ac pater, venerabili Dei servo plenissime confidebat; quare non modo eum omnibus aulae regiae famulis praefecit, sed voluit quoque ut se moneret, si quid fecisset reprehensione dignum. Die xxx mensis aprilis anno MDCCCLXXXII baptismo et confirmatione donatus est et primum ad sacram synaxim accessit, quam crebro deinde percepit. Animi suavitatem, caritatem religionisque studium prae se ferens, non modo iuvenes satis multos Christo lucratus est, sed etiam pueris regis ceterisque aulicis consilio, hortationibus institit, ut regis Muanga libidini ne obsequerentur. Quod cum rex didicisset, coepit venerabilem Dei famulum aversari, donec, primi administri, qui Iosepho invidebat, sollicitationibus expugnatus, morte eum plecti iussit. Iosephus, caelesti epulo recreatus, in locum Mengo abducitur, ubi, postquam denunciavit, se regi et veniam dare et paenitentiam consulere, prima persecutionis victima, a carnifice, capite abscisso, in ignem conicitur, die xv mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV, aetatis suae sexto et vicesimo.—Ioannes Maria Muzéi (Iamari), in pago Minziro natus, tantum prae se ferebat gravitatem ut cognomine Muzéi, idest senis, honestatus sit; prudentia quoque, caritate, suavitate animi, largitate in pauperes, aegrorum amore insignis, pecuniam operamque suam in captivos redimendos contulit, quos christiana fide imbuebat. Is fertur uno die universam catechesim didicisse; baptismo autem ablutus est calendis novembribus anno MDCCCLXXXV et sacro chrismate perlinitus insequenti anno, die iii mensis iunii. Postquam Iosephus Mkasa, amicissimus suus, immolatus est, cum se a rege interemptum iri intellexisset, occultare se noluit, nedum fugam caperet; immo etiam, comitante quodam Kulugi, regi in conspectum se dedit, a quo, causa quaedam interposita, primum administrum adire iussus est. Fecit, etsi insidias suspicabatur, quod religionis causa pavere atque extimescere a se alienum putaret. Primus vero regis administer eum in stagnum, quod in praedio suo situm erat, proiici iussit die xxvii mensis ianuarii anno MDCCCLXXXVII.—Dionysius Sebuggwao, in pago Bunono natus, puer regius, die xvii mensis novembris anno MDCCCLXXXV baptismum accepit morumque integritate floruit. Quem cum rex Muanga rogasset num duos aulicos christianae fidei rudimenta doceret, affirmantem, lanceae ictu confodit, eiusque caput abscindi iussit. Itē Dionysius die xxvi mensis maii anno MDCCCLXXXVI, aetatis suae sexto decimo, martyr occubuit.—Quisquis horum omnium Acta martyrum perlegerit, mirabitur profecto qua sapientia, quam tranquilla animi constantia et quo fidei spiritu ii, cum regis, tum primi administri et carnificum percontationibus responderint, in iisque divinum Christi promissum *‘dabitur enim vobis in illa hora quid loquamini’* plane servatum animadvertet. Constat etiam, gloriosum Venerabilium Dei Famulorum martyrium signa esse consecuta. Etenim non modo persecutores omnes tam misero mortis genere interierunt, ut liqueat, iustissimas ab iis poenas, quae culpae mirandum in modum responderent, Deum repetere voluisse, sed etiam, ilico post eorundem duorum et viginti nigritarum supplicium, adeo



animorum ardor ad catholicam fidem amplectendam auctus est, ut sit effuso martyrum sanguini tribuendum, testibus indigenis ipsis, quod, voluntatibus commutatis, latius in dies religio propagata sit atque adhuc propagetur. Et sane, post quattuor et triginta ab iis eventibus annos, plura centena millia catechumenorum et baptizatorum in ea regione numerantur. Hisce vero de causis factum est, ut de viginti duorum nigritarum martyrio canonicae inquisitiones instituerentur: quibus rite peractis, fel. rec. decessor Noster Pius Pp. X, die xiv mensis augusti anno MCMXII, decretum signavit de introducenda Causa beatificationis seu declarationis martyrii venerabilium Dei famulorum Caroli Lwanga, Matthiae Murumba et Sociorum vulgo 'de Uganda.' Postquam vero facultatem Nosmetipsi fecimus, die xix mensis decembris anno MCMXVIII, ex qua de martyrio et causa martyrii, itemque de signis seu miraculis, disceptari liceret, quamvis nondum elapsi essent quinquaginta anni a Venerabilium Servorum Dei nece, denique, cum in Congregatione Generali, coram Nobis habita, omnes qui convererant, cum Reverendissimi Cardinales S. Rituum Congregationi praepositi, tum Patres Consultores, sententiam quisque suam protulissent, Nos dominico die secundo Quadragesimae, idest nono ac vicesimo mensis februarii, hoc anno, sollemniter decrevimus, constare de martyrio et causa martyrii venerabilium famulorum Dei Caroli Lwanga, Matthiae Murumba et Sociorum. Illud unum supererat ut iidem VV. FF. NN. et Patres Consultores rogerentur, utrum tuto procedi posse censerent ad beatorum honores iisdem venerabilibus Dei famulis decernendos. Quod fecit Venerabilis Frater Noster Cardinalis Vincentius Vannutelli, Episcopus Ostiensis et Praenestinus, Sacri Conlegii Decanus et Causae Relator, in generali conventu coram Nobis habito die tertio ac vicesimo mensis martii vertentis anni; omnesque cum Reverendissimi Cardinales tuendis Ritibus praepositi, tum qui aderant Patres Consultores tuto procedi posse responderunt. Attamen in tanti momenti re Nostram aperire mentem distulimus, donec impensis precibus a Patre luminum auxilium posceremus. Quod cum interea fecissemus, tandem die dominico in Albis, idest xi mensis aprilis, sacris pientissime operati, accitis Reverendissimis Cardinalibus Antonio Vico, Episcopo Portuensi et S. Rufinae, S. Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, et Vincentio Vannutelli, Episcopo Ostiensi et Praenestino, Sacri Conlegii Decano et Causae Relatore, nec non Angelo Mariani, Fidei Promotore generali, et Alexandro Verde, S. Rituum Congregationis Secretario, sollemni decreto ediximus tuto procedi posse ad venerabilium servorum Dei Caroli Lwanga, Matthiae Murumba et Sociorum Martyrum vulgo 'de Uganda' sollemnem Beatificationem. Quae cum ita sint, precibus permoti complurium Archiepiscoporum, Episcoporum et religiosorum Ordinum, necnon totius Congregationis Missionariorum Africae, auctoritate Nostra Apostolica, harum Litterarum vi, concedimus ut Venerabiles Dei Famuli Carolus Lwanga, Matthias Murumba eorumque viginti Socii, Martyres, quos supra singillatim enumeravimus, Beati in posterum appellentur, eorumque lypsana seu reliquiae, non tamen in sollemnibus supplicationibus deferendae, publicae venerationi proponantur, atque imagines radiis decorentur. Praeterea, eadem apostolica

Nostra auctoritate, concedimus, ut de illis recitetur Officium et Missa singulis annis de Communi Plurimorum Martyrum cum Orationibus propriis per Nos adprobatis, secundum rubricas Breviarii et Missalis Romani. Hanc vero Officii recitationem et Missae celebrationem fieri dumtaxat concedimus in omnibus et singulis domibus Missionariorum Africae, qui vulgo *Patres Albi* nuncupantur, et in omnibus Praefecturis et Vicariatibus Apostolicis eidem Congregationi commissis vel in posterum committendis, ab omnibus Christifidelibus, qui Horas canonicas recitare teneantur, et, quod ad Missam attinet, ab omnibus sacerdotibus cum saecularibus tum regularibus ad templa, in quibus festum agitur, confluentibus. Denique concedimus ut Sollemnia Beatificationis eorundem Venerabilium Dei Famulorum in domibus et Praefecturis et Vicariatibus supra dictis, die per Ordinarios praefiniendo, peragi queant, intra annum postquam eadem sollemnia in Basilica Vaticana celebrata erunt. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, ac decretis de non cultu editis ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque. Volumus autem ut harum Litterarum exemplis etiam impressis, dummodo manu Secretarii S. Rituum Congregationis subscripta sint et sigillo Praefecti munita, eadem prorsus in disceptationibus etiam iudicialibus fides habeatur, quae Nostrae voluntatis significationi, hisce Litteris ostensis, haberetur.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die VI mensis iunii anno MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*

## OUR LADY OF LORETO IS DECLARED THE PATRONESS OF AERONAUTS

(March 24, 1920)

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM

### DECRETUM

B. MARIA VIRGO LAURETANA AËREONAUTARUM PATRONA DECLARATUR

Sanctissimus Dominus noster Benedictus Papa XV, piis quorundam Sacrorum Antistitum et aliorum fidelium supplicibus votis, ab infra-scripto Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecto relatis, libentissime obsecundans, Beatissimam Mariam Virginem, Lauretanam nuncupatam, omnium aëreonautarum praecipuam apud Deum Patronam supremam auctoritate Sua declaravit et constituit. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 24 martii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,  
*S. R. C. Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*



A NEW FORMULA OF BLESSING OF AN AEROPLANE APPROVED  
BY THE S. CONGREGATION OF RITES

(March 24, 1920)

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM

BENEDICTIO MACHINAE ITINERI AËREO DESTINATAE

*V.* Adiutórium nostrum in nómine Domini.

*R.* Qui fecit caelum et terram.

*V.* Benedic, ánima mea, Dómino.

*R.* Dómine, Deus meus, magnificátus es veheménter.

*V.* Qui ponis nubem ascénsum tuum.

*R.* Qui ámbulas super pennas ventórum.

*V.* Dómine, exáudi oratióem meam.

*R.* Et clamor meus ad te véniat.

*V.* Dóminus vobíscum.

*R.* Et cum spíritu tuo.

Orémus.

Oratio.

Deus, qui ómnia propter temetípsum operátus es, et cuncta mundi huius eleménta in usum humáni géneris destinásti: béne~~x~~dic, quaésumus, hanc máchinam (has máquinas) itíneri aëreo deputátam (deputátas); ut ad laudem et glóriam nóminis tui látius propagándam, et ad res humánas prómptius expediéndas, damno quovis et perículo remóto, desérviat (desérviant), et in ómnium fidélium, eámdem máchinam (eásdem máquinas) adhibéntium, ánimis caeléstia fóveat (fóveant) desidéria. Per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

*R.* Amen.

Orémus.

Oratio.

Deus, qui beátae Maríae Vírginis domum per Incarnáti Verbi mystérium misericórditer consecrásti, eámque in sinu Ecclésiae tuae mirabiliter collocásti: effúnde, quaésumus, bene ~~x~~ dictiónem tuam super hanc máchinam (has máquinas); ut, qui per eam (eas) itíneri aëreo sub tutéla eiúsdem beátae Vírginis se commiserint, eo quo tendunt prospere pervéniant, et incólumes ad própria revertántur. Per eundem Christum Dóminum nostrum.

*R.* Amen.

Orémus.

Oratio.

Deus, in te sperántium salus, fámulis tuis iter aëreum peragéntibus ac tuam opem invocántibus, Angelum bonum de caelis cómitem benígnus adiúnge: ut ab eo custodiántur in ómnibus viis, et ad propósitam sibi metam feliciter deducántur. Per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

*R.* Amen.

*Sacerdos aspergat aqua benedicta.*

Sanctissimus Domínus noster Benedictus Papa XV hanc formulam

benedictionis machinae itineribus aëreis destinatae, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione revisam atque dispositam et ab infrascripto Cardinali eidem Sacro Coetui Praefecto relatam, approbavit, eamque Appendici *Rituali Romani* inserendam iussit.

Die 24 martii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,  
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius*.

## BISHOPS OF REGULAR ORDERS ARE GRANTED THE PRIVILEGE OF WEARING THE ROCHETTE

(April 25, 1920)

### MOTU PROPRIO

EPISCOPIS E REGULARIBUS ORDINIBUS USUM ROCHETI CONCEDIT

#### BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Episcopis e regularibus Ordinibus, monachorum scilicet et mendicantium, consuevit Apostolica Sedes postulantibus concedere *rocheti* gestandi facultatem. Nobis autem, occasione sacrorum solemnium, quae appetunt, ob duplicem Canonizationem, placet, uniformitatis quoque gratia, omnes Venerabiles Fratres huius facultatis compotes facere. Quare motu proprio in perpetuum statuimus, ut omnes Episcopi regulares iam nunc rochetto utantur, atque eodem prorsus modo induti incedant ac saeculares Episcopi, salvo nimirum usitato vestimentorum colore et qualitate. Itaque, praeter casus in quibus, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum et Decreta, mozzeta tantum super rochetto, aut mozzeta cum mantelletto gestari debet aut potest, alias, uti omnes Episcopi, semper in hac alma Urbe mantelletum tantum super rochetto gerant: non obstantibus Constitutionibus apostolicis, ceterisque quamvis speciali mentione dignis, in contrarium facientibus quiblibet.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die xxv mensis aprilis anno mcmxx, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

#### BENEDICTUS PP. XV

## DECREE OF THE HOLY OFFICE REGARDING THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

(April 23, 1920)

ACTA SS. CONGREGATIONUM

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

### DECRETUM

CIRCA AUTHENTIAM MOSAICAM PENTATEUCI

Quaesitum est ab hac Suprema Congregatione Sancti Officii: 'Utrum doctrina circa authentiam mosaicam Pentateuci, nuper exposita in opere: *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*, an. 1919, fasc. XV, sub titulo,



*Moïse et Josué* ; nec non in *Revue du Clergé français*, XCIX (1<sup>o</sup> sept. 1919) pag. 321-343, sub titulo, *Moïse et le Pentateuque*, tuto tradi possit.'

Et in generali consessu habito feria iv, die 21 aprilis 1920, Eñi ac Rñi Domini Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales, praehabito DD. Consultorum voto, respondendum decreverunt : *Negative*.

Insequenti vero feria v, die 22 eiusdem mensis et anni, Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus divina Providentia Papa XV, in solita audientia R. P. D. Assessori S. Officii impertita, relata Sibi Eñorum et Rñorum Patrum resolutionem approbavit, confirmavit et evulgandam praecepit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 23 aprilis 1920.

A. Castellano, *S. C. S. Off. Notarius*.

**THE WORKS OF THE AUTHOR KNOWN AS 'GUIDO DA VERONA'  
ARE PUT ON THE INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS**

(April 23, 1920)

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

**DECRETUM**

DAMNANTUR OPERA OMNIA AUCTORIS VULGO 'GUIDO DA VERONA'

*Feria IV, die 21 aprilis 1920*

In generali consessu Supræmæ S. Congregationis S. Officii Eñi ac Rñi Domini Cardinales fidei et moribus tutandis praepositi proscripserunt, damnaverunt atque in Indicem librorum prohibitorum inserenda mandarunt

auctoris vulgo *Guido da Verona* opera omnia.

Et insequenti feria v, die 22 eiusdem mensis et anni, Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus divina Providentia Papa XV, in solita audientia R. P. D. Assessori S. Officii impertita, relata sibi Eñorum Patrum resolutionem approbavit, confirmavit et publicandam iussit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 23 aprilis 1920.

A. Castellano, *S. C. S. Off. Notarius*.

# REVIEWS AND NOTES

THE CATHOLIC STUDENT. By Rev. Michael Hickey, D.D. Dublin : Browne & Nolan, Ltd.

THE title epitomizes the book. The author writes for students, writes for Catholics. The student life and the Catholic life have their specific characteristics. Dr. Hickey points out the harmony that should exist between them and how it is brought about, in the workings of the mind and of the soul, in intellectual life and in individual religious life, in the scientific field and in the social field.

The lectures are dedicated to the Catholic students of University College, Dublin, of which Dr. Hickey is Dean of Residence. The titles of the chapters will sufficiently indicate the subject-matter : *Serpens decepit me ; Domine, ut videam ; Domine, quid me vis facere ; In Cruce Salus ; Cum Timore et Tremore ; Beatus Vir ; Caritas Christi urget nos ; Cor Jesu Sacratissimum ; Cor Mariæ Immaculatum ; Gaudent in Coelis*. There is a set purpose and plan throughout. One might remark that there is an abundance of treatises on Catholic Doctrine ; what need for more ? It is the application of this doctrine to student life and mind that is the special appeal of the present work. Father Rickaby, S.J., has written a similar work, *The Lord is my Light*, from lectures delivered to the Catholic Undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge. The viewpoint is absolutely different in both these works. Father Rickaby's is rather concerned with removing current prejudices and misconceptions concerning the Catholic Church, and with instructing the layman on points of theology that he ought to know, whilst Dr. Hickey is more concerned with fashioning a code of conduct out of Catholic theology in the student's intellectual and moral life. | His specific purpose is to guide the young intellectuals, the budding scientists, to put them on their guard at the most receptive period of their life, to point out the snares and the safe places. The demon of deceit is very busy with the expanding intellect. The Pharisee of another age may well betray himself through a false intellectualism in the young student. Humility, Faith, Simplicity, and Truth are the four corner-stones of the noble edifice of human science. They are also the four fundamental traits of the Christian character. Religion in the heart, which means the putting on of Christ, enriches and perfumes all our natural virtues. And the Catholic religion is not merely a new code or law, but rather a new principle, a new life, a new power. The great *Fiat* after that of Creation, of the Incarnation, of Redemption, is that of our own co-operation. Goethe asked : ' Oh, for a sentence on which I could live my life.' Dr. Hickey



replies: '*Fiat Voluntas Tua* is that one sentence.' But that means the putting on of Christ Crucified in body, mind, judgment, will. On the famous cross of Cong we read the inscription: *Hac cruce tegitur crux Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*. This same inscription, if only we have the eye of faith to see it, is written on all our daily crosses. They all conceal the real Cross of Christ. The Cross is the Covenant of Safety, 'the compendium of all God's covenants with the children of men.' And so *cum timore et tremore* the work of salvation is accomplished.

Perhaps, the most beautiful, among many beautiful chapters, are those on the Beatitudes and on the *Caritas Christi* and their application to student life, internal and external, for the individual welfare and for the welfare of the community. There is real genius shown not only in the composition but in the selection of the material. Happy snatches of poetry appeal to the imagination and give a pleasant variety to the subject matter. Dr. Hickey furnishes abundant apt quotations from the Scriptures and the Fathers, from poets, philosophers, modern divines and scientists. He emphasizes the fundamentals and drives home their significance and importance. He is always direct and candid. His style catches one immediately by its force and its simplicity. He has written not only a most useful book but a book that will appeal to all, students and others, by its freshness of outlook and by its novelty of treatment. We hope that it is the forerunner of other beautiful works from his pen.

M. R.

**TWENTY CURES AT LOURDES MEDICALLY EXAMINED.** By Dr. de Grandmaison. London: Sands & Co.

It seems superfluous to discuss at this time of day the cures at Lourdes. The Bureau there is open to all medical men who wish to investigate the cases. Many of them have foolishly ventured the explanation—suggestion, for instance, in a case of cancer. Others admit the facts, but admit also their inability to explain them. We know all that. The time has passed when a Zola can deceive people by labelling the cures frauds. In his novel *Lourdes* he deliberately distorted the facts so as to escape having to admit their supernatural character. He was wont to say that he would believe in the miracles of Lourdes did he but see a scratch healed up. He was shown things far more wonderful. The very cases he misrepresented are fortunately only too easily recognized. The full discussion of them is included in the present volume, which contains what we may call the classical cures.

The whole question is one for medical men. Dr. de Grandmaison is not the only one who has written on the cures from a medical standpoint. We have the magnificent work of Dr. Bertrin and another of Dr. Boissarie, who was head of the Bureau until his death in 1917. But in no work have we such a detailed array of facts, documents, and proofs, as in the book before us. All the cases are dealt with in a clinical manner, and those who know most about medicine will most fully appreciate the care that has been taken over them. It is on the analysis and welding

together of this medical documentary evidence that the whole investigation turns. Besides, every year, in the second half of November, the Medical Bureau holds a reunion in Paris to review the cures wrought during the preceding pilgrimages. Medical men from the different Paris hospitals are present to investigate the cases, and the patients and witnesses are there also to be examined. Of all the cures that Lourdes Medical Bureau has admitted to be extraordinary, there is not a single one of which it can be said, from the *strictly medical standpoint*, that it has not been maintained.

The cures of Lourdes show three dominant characteristics: their rapidity, the cure being sometimes instantaneous; the simplicity or even nullity of the curative agencies; their habitual coincidence with prayer or some manifestation of piety. These traits are closely examined by the author, who likewise deals with a score of objections and refutes them from the medical standpoint. The value of the book, apart from the conclusive evidence of the cures, is enhanced by the clear and easy course in physiology and hygiene which it contains. The author abstains throughout from bringing in the term *supernatural*, but he does not hesitate to give as his conclusion the short and simple answer to the question—How are the cures to be accounted for? By the *supernatural*.

The book is one of surpassing interest, especially, to medical men. It will be a revelation to many who have hesitated to face the facts which are now brought out into the clear light of day for scientific dissection. An admirable little introduction by Sir Bertram Windle puts the case pointedly to the Medical Faculty. It is for them now to explain the phenomena.

M. R.

### BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

- America*: A Catholic Review (July).
- The Ecclesiastical Review* (July). U.S.A.
- The Rosary Magazine* (July). Somerset, Ohio.
- The Catholic World* (July). New York.
- The Austral Light* (June). Melbourne.
- The Ave Maria* (June). Notre Dame, Indiana.
- The Irish Monthly* (July). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
- The Catholic Bulletin* (July). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.
- The Month* (July). London: Longmans.
- Études* (July). Paris: 12 Rue Oudinot (VIIe).
- Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* (July). Paris: Beauchesne.
- Revue du Clergé Français* (July). Paris: Letouzey et Ané.
- The Fortnightly Review* (July). St. Louis, Mo.
- The Lamp* (July). Garrison, N.Y.
- Revue des Jeunes* (July). Paris: 3 Rue de Luynes.
- The Homiletic Monthly* (August). London: Burns & Oates.



# ON THE HISTORY OF MENTAL PRAYER IN THE ORDER OF ST. DOMINIC

BY REV. R. P. DEVAS, O.P.

It is sometimes said that mental prayer, in anything like the form in which we know it to-day, did not exist in the early days of the Order of St. Dominic; that *no* sort of mental prayer existed as a community duty, to be performed at fixed time and place; that for Dominicans, as for members of the other old monastic Orders, mental prayer was really unnecessary, on account of their long liturgical observances;<sup>1</sup> and, lastly, that the half-an-hour's mental prayer, morning and evening, in vogue to-day, was introduced under the influence of the Jesuits, that is, of their example and régime.

Let me quote, for example, what the celebrated Father Poulain, S.J., has written upon this subject. 'Before the fifteenth century, or even the sixteenth,' he says, 'the usage of methodical mental prayer—prayer, that is to say, where the *subject*, *method*, and *duration* are determined—is not traceable in the Church.'<sup>2</sup> He adds, in a footnote: 'The Carthusians, however, seem to have had a time set apart for mental prayer from the first,' and he refers the

<sup>1</sup> It has even been asserted that the morning meditation, being obligatory, makes daily sung community Mass impossible. If this assertion were true, I should reply that daily sung Mass must then have been far more impossible in bygone days, when the time allotted to Office and prayer was so much longer. (Cf., among all the other well-known evidence for this statement, the present paper.) But, of course, the assertion is not true. Daily sung Mass is not impossible, nor impossibly hard, even with the difficulty created by the modern *frustulum*, or breakfast. In some places it is arranged for thus: Early private Masses; First community duty, the half-an-hour's Mental Prayer (and during it Mass and novices' Communion); Second half-hour, second set of private Masses, simultaneously with two or more Little Hours and a brief interval; Third half-hour, sung Mass attended by all. In other places, the *frustulum* is taken earlier, and the sung Mass does not follow immediately, but after the first lecture or class.

<sup>2</sup> *The Graces of Interior Prayer (Des Graces d'Oraison)*. English trans. Kegan Paul, 1912, p. 97; italics his.

reader to Guigo's well-known twelfth-century *Consuetudines*. But, nothing daunted by these apparent objections to his thesis, Father Poulain proceeds in the text :—

In order to avoid all misunderstandings I insist upon this point : that it is solely a question here of methodical mental prayer, and not of that without fixed rules, made when you choose, for as long as you feel the attraction, or on a subject chosen according to the inspiration of the moment. It is clear that from all times persons have reflected with this freedom on the truths of salvation, and have sought to recollect themselves in God without the recitation of formulas. This, I admit, was mental prayer, but of a different kind.

This matter settled, here are some proofs of my proposition.

It seems that the prayer of the old Orders consisted in penetrating the mind with ideas inspired by the Divine Office and Holy Scripture ; then in free moments it reverted peacefully to these thoughts without any preconceived plan. The rules of Orders before the sixteenth century contain no definite instructions regarding prayer, apart from the Divine Office. By the word *oratio*, they intend to signify vocal prayer. We must guard against interpreting this word in accordance with our modern ideas. (See the collection of rules published by Holstenius, Librarian of the Vatican : *Codex regularum*, Rome, 1666.)<sup>1</sup>

Father Poulain then instances the Carmelites, the Dominicans, and the Franciscans.

With regard to the Order of St. Dominic [he says], a Father Provincial has been good enough to give me the following information. In the early traditions of the Order, there is never any question of individual prayers, at specified hours and of fixed durations (see two thirteenth-century writers, Blessed Humbert de Romans and Gerard de Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum*). It is in 1505, nearly three hundred years after the foundation of the Order, that a change appears at the Chapter of Milan. Henceforward there is to be mental prayer in choir, in community, for half-an-hour in the morning and as much in the evening. From 1569 onwards twelve successive Chapters considered it necessary to repeat this direction, making it ever more and more urgent.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, Father Poulain offers some explanation of this supposed state of things.

These customs of the old Orders are due to many causes. The first is that the vocal prayer was long in many monasteries, and in this case it would have been extremely fatiguing to have had to go on to meditate afterwards by learned methods

Another cause is that the effects of meditation were provided for by rules which ensured a persistent state of recollection, and by frequent prayers forming a series of stepping-stones throughout the whole course of the day. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 38.



Finally, the mode of prayer of the ancients is explained by the intellectual life of the time. Possessing very few books, they did not vary their readings as we do. They accustomed themselves to live with very few ideas, just as is the case now in the changeless East and the convents of the Greek rite. In old days the soul was less complicated, slower than our own, and their prayer felt the effects of this condition.<sup>1</sup>

*His non obstantibus*, that is to say, with all respect to such a well-known writer as Father Poulain, I venture to suggest that what corresponded *very closely indeed*, if not absolutely, to mental prayer as we know it to-day, existed from the very earliest times of the Order of Preachers; that it existed, moreover, to some extent as a community duty, to be performed at fixed time and place; that it was always considered most necessary, even when the fullest liturgical observances were carried out; and, lastly, that General Chapters legislated for it before there can have been any question of Jesuit influence.

#### I—MENTAL PRAYER EXISTED IN THE EARLIEST DAYS OF THE ORDER

In what does mental prayer consist? There are but three essential things in it: *considerations*, *affections*, and *resolutions*; or spiritual reflections, affections, and reference to one's immediate future. Now, these three constituents appear quite plainly in the 'definite instructions regarding prayer' given by Bl. Humbert de Romans, one of the two very writers referred to by Father Poulain.<sup>2</sup>

1. *Concerning the Considerations*.—Bl. Humbert gives a long list of subjects (embracing everything) upon which the novices of the Order should meditate in *their orationes secretae*, e.g., the benefits of God, general and particular; ingratitude; the Creation, etc.; the Redemption, Incarnation and Passion, etc.; heaven and hell; the reprobate and the saved; the Scriptures; their own defects; the deceits of the devil; the ministry of the angels; the example of the Saints; the perversity of the damned; their own interior state, and exterior; God's omnipotence and knowledge; His goodness, severity, mercy and justice; His hidden and manifest judgments, etc.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 39. Surely all our famous friars were not men of few ideas!

<sup>2</sup> Bl. Humbert († 1277) was the fifth Master-General of the Order, and is sufficiently famous.

<sup>3</sup> *Opera*, ed. Berthier, vol. ii. p. 231; Rome, 1888.

Again, he says in another place :—

Sciendum autem quod haec duo tempora [i.e., in the morning and evening] non solum orationi sed et *meditationi* congruunt. Matutinum tempus congruit meditationi, quia tunc est anima limpidior ad videndum . . . Vespertinum tempus congruit meditationi, quia tunc recolligendus est spiritus ab actionibus et ad se reducendus. . . . Patet ergo ex praedictis quam assidue et propter quid insistendum est ferventer devotioni *secretarum orationum*; <sup>1</sup>

which shows that the secret prayers were equivalent to *meditationes*, i.e., reflections or considerations.

Lastly, in the Appendix to Bl. Humbert, which is of the thirteenth century, if not actually written by him, the novices are told that their evening secret prayer may take the form of, or at least include, an examination of conscience, moving them to contrition and to think of the benefits of God.<sup>2</sup> And of the individual novice it is said : 'Cogitet et revolvat cum ardore beneficia Dei : scilicet Incarnationis, Nativitatis, Passionis et hujusmodi generalia ; et aliqua specialiter ei collata, scilicet, etc.'<sup>3</sup>

From all of this it is abundantly clear that what we now call *considerations*, formed part, and indeed the first part, of the *orationes secretae*.

2. *Concerning the Affections*.—Emphasizing the excellence of these secret prayers, Bl. Humbert proceeds to say : 'Praeterea generant majorem *affectionem*. Potest enim sic orans plus morari circa singula *meditando*, et ex hujusmodi morosis cogitationibus generantur majores *affectiones* desideriorum sanctorum.'<sup>4</sup> Again, for the instruction of novices, he says :—

Sunt autem ex hujusmodi et similibus [meditationibus], diversae trahendae *affectiones*, modo spei, modo timoris, modo doloris, modo gemitus de malis, modo suspirii ad bona, modo admirationis, modo exclamationis, modo gratiarum actionis, modo supplicationis, modo verecundiae, modo reverentiae, et hujusmodi, quae per experientiam melius quam per doctrinam addiscuntur.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, speaking of the fruit of good meditations, Bl. Humbert says :—

Ex justitiae meditatione oritur *affectio* timoris ; ex misericordiae

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. pp. 96, 97.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 544. Perhaps it was in this sense that Bl. Humbert wrote earlier : 'Item orandum est mane propter futura ; orandum est in sero propter praeterita . . . sc. . . . ut praeterita male facta remittantur' (i. p. 166).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ii. 544 and 543, under the title, *Incipit de modo orandi eorum*.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. i. 173. Italics mine.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. ii. 231 Italics mine.



meditatione oritur *affectio spei*; ex sapientiae meditatione videntis omnia oritur *affectio erubescenciae*; ex beneficentiae meditatione oritur *affectio gratitudinis et amoris*; ex suavitatis meditatione oritur sancta esuries: et alia multa bona ex hujusmodi meditationibus circa Deum generantur in meditante de eo.<sup>1</sup>

Here, then, were the *affections* as clearly as the considerations.

3. *Concerning the Resolutions*.—Even as the word *consideratio* had a different signification in the thirteenth century from what it has in our own,<sup>2</sup> so the word *resolutio* in connexion with the subject of prayer does not occur at all, as far as I know, in Bl. Humbert. Nevertheless, I venture to believe that some definite and practical resolution was what the *orationes secretae* were meant directly to lead up to. We have seen (*supra*, p. 180) how contrition was included in the evening prayer; and in another place Bl. Humbert says of the novices: ‘Item, quod in oratione ad contritionem, vel compunctionem incitandam potius debent intendere, quam in multis dicendis laborare.’<sup>3</sup> Now no contrition is complete without firm purpose, or *resolution*, of amendment. This is why immediately above he has written: ‘Immo secundum varias necessitates modo pro peccato, vel offensa tali, vel talibus remittendis, vel cavendis, vel pro talibus defectibus tollendis, vel talibus gratiis aut virtutibus conferendis, et similibus devote supplicare [debent].’<sup>4</sup> What does this imply if not some definite resolution?

Again, Bl. Humbert says that whereas the hours for the Divine Office vary according to the season, this is not the case with regard to the morning and evening *orationes secretae*. And he gives the reason: ‘Orandum est mane ut in actionibus diurnis oratione dirigamur, . . . sero, ut oratione contra tentationes nocturnas muniamur.’<sup>5</sup> Again, he says that whereas the Divine Office consists largely of prayer of praise, the secret prayers are ‘*petitiones magis quam laudes*,’ and also that in them ‘*petit quilibet quod sibi placet secundum indigentiam suam*. . . . Cuilibet autem magis necessarium est magis laborare pro eo quo indiget magis,’<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. ii. 87, 88. Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *ibid.* ii. 90.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ii. 229.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. ii. 228, 229.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. i. 166, and compare i. 163. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. i. 173. Italics mine.

which, understood of spiritual things, implies the making of resolutions.

Lastly, *immediately* after giving examples of the considerations and affections in prayer (which I have quoted above), Bl. Humbert proceeds to suggest the virtues to be acquired and the snares and vices to be avoided; <sup>1</sup> in other words, precisely what we should call examples of, or matter for, the resolutions.

*Resolutions*, then, appear in all but name, as the natural result of the *orationes secretae*.

So much, then, for this first point: Mental prayer existed in the earliest days of the Order, corresponding very closely indeed, if not absolutely, with mental prayer as we know it to-day. The very word was familiar in the thirteenth century, for Bl. Humbert says of the secret prayers, '*Sunt enim magis mentales quam vocales.*'<sup>2</sup> And exhorting the brethren to the practice of this kind of prayer, he appeals to the example of Our Lord and the Apostles, and then to Blessed Dominic, our father, '*qui tam frequenter etiam pernoctabat in orationibus, carens lecto.*' He appeals again to the example of the early brethren of the Order, '*sicut dicunt illi qui viderunt statum Ordinis primitivum,*' and proceeds to quote (*pace* Father Poulain) what is to be found in the *Vitae Fratrum* of Gerard de Frachet.<sup>3</sup>

## II—MENTAL PRAYER EXISTED, MOREOVER, TO SOME EXTENT, AS A COMMUNITY DUTY, TO BE PERFORMED AT FIXED TIME AND PLACE

There was no constitution, or ordination of a General Chapter, to this effect; but, as will be seen, it was just one of those praiseworthy approved customs, which in the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. ii. 231-233.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. i. 173. Italics mine. Perhaps a little more vocal prayer entered into the old mental prayer than we are accustomed to. The *modus orandi* of the novices referred to in the text (cf. *supra*, p. 180) possibly seems to suggest this. Commenting, again, on the words in the Rule of St. Augustine: '*Psalmis et hymnis cum oratis Deum,*' etc., Bl. Humbert says: '*Psalmis, id est orationibus secretis, in quibus ut frequenter dicuntur psalmi*' (i. 182); but the context shows that this had nothing to do with the formal recitation of psalms, and we must not forget that, in those days, ejaculations and (unspoken) prayers in meditation, will have often been (in the mind, at least) in terms of psalms, so familiar was their use. '*Fere quidem,*' adds Bl. Humbert just below, '*quidquid est in psalmis est oratio, immo orationes sanctissimae et devotae.*'

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. i. 172, and ii. 91.



Order of St. Dominic are binding on the subject. ‘Dicendum est ad hoc,’ says Bl. Humbert, ‘quod ligantur [fratres] ad consuetudines approbatas, et quae communiter observantur. Est enim consuetudo lex non scripta; constitutio vero lex scripta: unde cum utrumque sit lex, utrumque ligat.’<sup>1</sup>

Now, as Bl. Humbert carefully distinguishes between *orationes ordinariae* and *orationes extraordinariae*, in general,<sup>2</sup> so does he equally carefully distinguish, as will be seen, between the ordinary *orationes secretae*, morning and evening, and *orationes [secretae] extraordinariae*, which may be made at any time and in any place. The former he calls, respectively, the *oratio matutinalis, quae dicitur in Prima*<sup>3</sup> (distinct from the Hour of that name in the Divine Office), and the *oratio secreta, quae dicitur in Complectorio*, that is, *post Completorium*; <sup>4</sup> and he proceeds to develop at some length the reasons why morning and evening are fitting times for these ordinary secret prayers.

At first sight, one might be inclined to imagine that Bl. Humbert supposed, or desired, *privacy* for secret prayers. He prefers them to the Divine Office, for example, because they do not take place *coram hominibus*; <sup>5</sup> because one can pour oneself out more freely in them than when *in conspectu hominum*; <sup>6</sup> because, whereas for the Office one depends upon other people, and upon place and time, in *this* case one can pray at any time, in any place, and without companions; <sup>7</sup> because, finally, the Office needs strength of body, while mental prayer, on the contrary, is possible as long as there is strength of spirit.<sup>8</sup>

But the answer to the apparent objection underlying these arguments begins at once to unroll itself in the following paragraph of Bl. Humbert. Mention has already been made of his giving us a fixed time (namely, early morning and after Complin) for secret, i.e., mental, prayer; and now he goes on to say that although such mental prayer *can* be made anywhere, it is *far better* and *more fruitful* if made in a *sacred place* or *oratory*. He adduces many reasons for this opinion, and then gives the example of the *two* men going up to the Temple to pray, namely, the Pharisee and the Publican, and, next, the example of

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. ii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. i. 153.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. i. 161 and 166.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. i. 164-166,

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. i. 173.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. i. 174.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

the *two* Apostles, Peter and John, who went up to the Temple at the ninth hour of prayer.<sup>1</sup> This at once puts a different complexion on his previous expressions, tending to show that it was the prayers he referred to as being in private, and not the persons. Indeed when he reverts to this subject in another place, some of these reasons for preferring mental prayer are more clearly put. For example, one reason is *propter tumultus absentiam*, another is because such prayer is better than when one is *in turba*, and a third is because the prayer is not *perturbata clamore* as in the Office.<sup>2</sup> And lastly, the example of the prayer of the early brethren of the Order, to which he twice appeals, is the example of the *ecclesia parvula, plena fratribus orantibus*, where there was evidently no privacy at all.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, with regard to the morning and evening mental prayer in particular, as opposed to secret prayers in general, Bl. Humbert makes it quite plain that it was not to be performed in private, but in public, as a common or community duty. This the following quotations will clearly show—*certainly*, with regard to the evening, and, by inference, with regard to the morning.

Item, *secundum morem nostrum* completorio sunt adnexae orationes secretae, quarum frequenter fructum amittunt qui non intersunt. Contra quod dicitur Matth. 6: Tu cum oraveris intra in cubiculum tuum, *scilicet secretum cordis*, et clauso ostio, ora Patrem tuum, et Pater tuus qui videt in abscondito, retribuet tibi. Et Bernardus *Super Cant.*: Quam serena et placita oratio nullo perturbato clamore!<sup>4</sup>

Notandum quod licet ad servos Dei devotos pertineat semper sic libenter orare, tamen propter hujusmodi orationes extraordinarias non debent dimitti *ea quae ordinarie sunt facienda*.<sup>5</sup>

Then ('De loco et tempore orationis secretae. . .'): 'Licet autem omnis locus aptus sit ad hujusmodi orationes, tamen aptior est locus secretus, et aptissimus locus sacer.'<sup>6</sup> Bl. Humbert develops these three *loci*, and with regard to the last, the *locus sacer*, he says: 'Patet hoc idem etiam ex iis quae supra dicta sunt circa divinum officium *dicendum in ecclesia*, et etiam *circa hanc* [orationem], quoad

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. i. 176.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ii. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. i. 172; ii. 92.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. i. 164. Italics mine.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. i. 176. *Ea* explicitly includes *prayers* (cf. *ibid.* i. 177).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. ii. 94. Italics mine. This is a quotation from St. Bernard.



locum.'<sup>1</sup> Whether this actually meant *in the choir*, will be seen below.

'Item, sciendum est quod licet omne tempus competat hujusmodi orationibus, tamen magis competit *tempus ad hoc specialiter deputatum*; sed maxime *tempus matutinum et vespertinum* inter omnia tempora orationi deputata.'<sup>2</sup> Bl. Humbert develops these three *tempora*. With regard to the last, referring to St. Bernard who advocated for such prayer, time free from occupation, he says:—

Tale autem est matutinum ante aggressum occupationum; item vespertinum post cessationem occupationum. Hinc est quod *deputata sunt apud nos specialiter ista duo tempora ad orandum*, scilicet matutinum post matutinas,<sup>3</sup> vespertinum post completorium, *in quibus fratres vacare debent orationibus secretis*, tam in conventu quam extra, vel plus vel minus pro tempore.<sup>4</sup>

Spatium vero [he says in another place<sup>5</sup>] quod conceditur ad orandum post completorium, nec minus prolixum sit, nec minus breve; sed medie temporatum et tam moderatum, quod fratres *communiter* sine fastidio possint illud tempus in oratione expendere: quod reputatur posse fieri cum tempus est tantum precise quod possint in illo dici psalmi septem et litania.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ii. 95. Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> Italics mine. After Matins, that is when the brethren did not return to bed, as was likely the custom of some of them sometimes, at least during the winter. In this case *their* mental prayer was very long, two hours at least — 'tanto temporis spatio, quantum homo de facile iret per octo millaria,' as we read of Bl. Jordan of Saxony in Galvagnus de la Flamma's *Cronica* (ed. Reichert, p. 86; Rome, 1897). The first part of this long meditation Bl. Humbert will have called *oratio extraordinaria*, the last part of it the *oratio matutinalis* which took place in *Prima* (about Prime time) which the brethren had always to attend (see continuation of the text). For normally, the brethren retired to rest again after Matins, and again *rose* for Prime (cf. i. 161); and elsewhere (ii. 69) Bl. Humbert speaks of the 'laudabilis consuetudo in Ordine ubique surgere semper mane multum ad Primam, sed magis mane in hyeme'; and again (ii. 157) from Lent to Holy Cross Prime began *die alta*, during the rest of the year *citius*, earlier in point of view of light, but perhaps later in point of view of time.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. ii. 96. Italics mine. And on p. 93, Bl. Humbert says that these mental prayers may not sometimes be neglected, but should be made always, and with great fervour.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. ii. 248. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> Italics mine. The reader may recall St. Vincent Ferrer's advice in this matter: 'In sero hoc communiter habeas, ut non multum vigiles: nam per vigiliam serotinam impeditur attentio et devotio in matutinali officio. . . . Igitur statuas tibi aliquas breves orationes, vel aliquam lectionem vel meditationem, quibus in sero antequam dormias, breviter occuperis. Et inter alias meditationes, si in hoc fertur tua devotio, potest tua mens ferri ad ea quae in Passione Domini illa hora contigerunt. . . . (Et illud negotium quandoque agitur sine Psalmis, et sine quibuscumque orationibus exterius formatis verbo,' yet, in spite of what Father Poulain has said, St. Vincent († 1419 explicitly calls it 'oratio. . . .) Et ideo in sero parum vigiles, ut totum spiritum

And there was a definite signal at the end of it. For

Patent ex jam dictis novem quae observamus in terminatione divini officii. . . . Quintum est quod Dominicam Orationem et Symbolum dicimus. . . . Sextum est quod B. Virgini nos recommendamus devote. Septimum est quod disciplinas recipimus. Octavum est quod meditationibus et orationibus secretis vacamus. Nonum est quod *ultimum signum* ad quiescendum facimus. Et haec quatuor ultima scripta non sunt, *sed ex usu servantur*.<sup>1</sup>

Bl. Humbert also directs that the Novice-Master should instruct the novices about their prayer—how they should spend their leisure time in prayer, and choose the church for it by preference, and visit the different altars but also (and *this* is the important point) how they should prefer *common* prayers to private ones, and among these common prayers he mentions the morning and evening mental prayer. ‘Quod in orationibus *communibus* magis quam in privatis debent confidere, et illis libentius interesse; sive in horis, *sive in privatis post completorium et post matutinas*.’<sup>2</sup>

Also, that they should spend their leisure time in *meditation*, wherever they be, ‘vel cum sunt in via . . . vel cum sunt in orationibus secretis,’<sup>3</sup> showing again that these prayers were distinct community duties.

Again, novices seem to have erred somewhat in their endeavour to imitate St. Dominic and the early brethren, for they evidently wandered about the church, even during their morning and evening secret prayers, as opposed to the extraordinary ones (in which they were at liberty to do so), and made, or endeavoured to make, their mental prayer in extraordinary positions or postures. All this was forbidden; and from the evidence available, it would

post Matutinas in studio et oratione valeas occupare’ (*Œuvres de St. Vincent Ferrier*, ed. Fages, pp. 90, 31; Paris, 1909). The word *oratio* was, of course, applied to both vocal and mental prayer. Bl. Humbert simply defines it as *pious affectus in Deum directus* (ii. 92).

<sup>1</sup> *Opera Bl. Humberti*, ii. 148. Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 229. (Italics mine.) The old text of the Constitutions says that the Novice-Master should instruct the novices ‘quomodo et quid orent, et quam silenter, ut aliis rugitum non faciant’ (D.I. cap. xiv. num. 234). There was evidently no question of privacy again. Bl. Humbert’s text continues: ‘et quod ad haec bene et devote dicenda debent magnam curam adhibere’; and a little lower: ‘Item, quomodo laborare debent ut in his quae dicunt orando cor versetur,’ but they were not to despair, nor think their prayer unfruitful, and give it up, if they did not always succeed. He had said long before: ‘Item, cum vadit quis ad locum deputatum orationi, plus laborando plus meretur’ (i. 170). The effort was what he demanded.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 231.



seem quite certain that the morning and evening mental prayer was always made in the church, and that in the case of novices at least (except when they had chapter of faults (cf. *infra*), it was actually, often if not always, made in the choir of the church.

Item, quod in orando non debent se super ventrem, vel in cruce extendere vel caput nimis inclinatum tenere; sed potius stando super genua erecti, vel aliquantulum incurvati orare debent.<sup>1</sup>

Item, post completorium et post matutinas debent esse in oratione, et specialiter diutius tempore hyemis; nec tunc stent superius in sedibus sacerdotum [in the back row of stalls] sed in inferioribus, vel ante altare majus; neque quaerant per ecclesias diverticula ad orandum.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, if the Fathers were allowed to leave the choir after Complin and go down into the church to make their mental prayer, the novices evidently were not always allowed to do so. The same conclusion is supported in the two following passages. Speaking of the novices, Bl. Humbert says: 'Quod ad haec [morning and evening mental prayer] bene et devote dicenda debent magnam curam adhibere; et quod ante plenam terminatione horarum, vel gratiarum, a choro sine necessitate non recedant.'<sup>3</sup> And again: 'Quinto, post completorium quando [novitius] exit de ecclesia et de choro'—let him say certain prayers, etc.<sup>4</sup> And again: '[Novitii] omnes remaneant in ecclesia vel in choro in oratione post completorium in hyeme vel in aestate.'<sup>5</sup>

Lastly, the novices are told that if their chapter of faults takes place after Matins in the church, care is to be taken to collect the stools or benches which they have been using, 'ne fratres qui vadunt per ecclesiam ad orandum impediuntur vel laedantur.'

Item, quando in capitulo fratrum dicit prior vel praelatus: *Vadant novitii ad lectum vel ad orationem*, tunc non debent habere capitulum pro illa vice; et tunc omnes novitii conveniant in aliqua parte ecclesiae coram aliquo altari, vel alibi, secundum quod magister novitiorum ordinauerit, et tunc antiquior novitius in Ordine prosequatur quod restat de *Pretiosa* dicendum, scilicet, *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*, etc. Quo dicto, vadant ad orationem statim cum silentio, et postmodum ad lectos suos.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. ii. 230.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ii. 532.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ii. 229. Italics mine.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. ii. 544.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. ii. 528. Italics mine.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. ii. 538. Italics mine. This will not perhaps have been their ordinary mental prayer, for if they were in need of more sleep, the mind will hardly have been *limpidior ad videndum*; cf. *supra*, p. 180.

This should be sufficient to show that mental prayer existed as a community duty, to be performed at fixed time and place.

### III—MENTAL PRAYER WAS ALWAYS CONSIDERED MOST NECESSARY

After what has been written in the foregoing pages,<sup>1</sup> it seems almost superfluous to press this point, for mental prayer would never have been insisted upon had it not been considered necessary. One or two more quotations, however, will perhaps be found of interest.

Bl. Humbert compares mental prayer with the Divine Office, and in no veiled language, puts the former in the first place. It has, he says, 'aliquas praerogativas super orationes solemnes [i.e., the Office]. . . . Secretae vero orationes sunt petitiones magis quam laudes, et ideo magis sunt in presenti *necessariae*.' In the Office, he says again, the petitions are fixed (*certae*) and are sometimes for what the individual does not himself need; whereas in mental prayer each one can devote his whole attention to his own special needs.

Again, the Office is the institution of the Church: mental prayer the institution of God. Mental prayer was practised by Our Lord, but He did not say any Office; therefore is the former more necessary, and, moreover, *everyone* can make it. It is, besides, more efficacious; for it is rather mental than vocal, and this makes it more efficacious. 'Cum invocarem, id est, intus vocarem, exaudivit me Dominus.'<sup>2</sup>

Lastly, we have seen above how Bl. Humbert twice appealed to the example of St. Dominic and the early brethren of the Order, with regard to the practice of mental prayer; and how insistent he was that it must *never* be omitted, morning or evening; and this was at a time when, as everyone knows, all the Office was sung, in all ordinary houses of the Order, as well as the daily Mass. Sacred as indeed they were, the manifold monastic observances were not considered as rendering mental prayer—that direct and intimate converse with God—any the less necessary.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially, pp. 180, 185.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. i. 172, 173.



IV—GENERAL CHAPTERS LEGISLATED FOR MENTAL PRAYER  
BEFORE THERE CAN HAVE BEEN ANY QUESTION OF  
JESUIT INFLUENCE

Before proving this very simple proposition, let us see how some of Bl. Humbert's successors, in their circular-letters accompanying the *Acta* of General Chapters, carried on his traditions in the matter of mental prayer.

Bl. John of Vercelli, Humbert's immediate successor, wrote in 1271 : ' De consuetudinibus nostri Ordinis approbatis formam formantis assumite discipline, ut ea servantes, que moribus sunt commendata majorem, sic, etc.'<sup>1</sup> And writing from Oxford in 1280, he speaks of '*orationem vigilancia, celos penetrans et contemplationis pennis*'—with the meaning which we have seen the word *oratio* does bear, at least at times. And finally, two years later, at Vienna, he said : ' Quo ministerio peracto salubriter actus nostri non occupentur in multis, sed potius ad claustrum solitudinem, vernantem Christi floribus, recurramus, orationi et contemplationi divine certam partem labentis *absque revocatione temporis deputantes*.'

Munio de Zamora wrote in 1288 : ' noctes in *oratione* ducentes insomnes celi limino perlustretis' ; and in 1289 : '*meditatione pensantes*.'<sup>2</sup>

Bl. Nicholas Trevisinus (afterwards Pope Benedict XI) wrote in 1296 : ' Lectioni iungatur oracio, que est *quoddam cum deo familiare colloquium* et cathena aurea, per quam rationalis animus a terrenis trahitur ad divina' ; and in 1298 : ' Sicque disposito delectabiliter erit laboris successio, ut vel cum aliis psallat in choro vel *insistat orationi secrete*, vel modeste conferat de auditis vel salubriter occupetur in utilitatibus alienis.'<sup>3</sup>

Aymericus (the next General but two) says (in 1308) : ' Lectioni addatur *oracio* et orationi *devocio*. Hic est enim funiculus ille triplex, qui difficile rumpitur, etc.'<sup>4</sup>

Berengarius (the next but one) writing from London in 1314, says : ' Assint insuper vobis vigiliarum excubie, *quies meditationis*, diligencia studii, *orationum instantia* et devocio psalmodie.'<sup>5</sup>

Herveus (the next General) in 1320, is urgent concerning *oratione devota* ; and in the following year he laments :

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Monumenta O.P. Lib Encyc.*, ed. Reichert (Rome, 1900), as also for the quotations in the text, which follow.

<sup>2</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>4</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>5</sup> Italics mine.

‘Sed pro dolor . . . *orationis fervor* tepuit, tepor devocionis invaluit.’<sup>1</sup>

Hugh de Vaucemain (the next but one) in 1333, exhorts the brethren: ‘Estote in *orationibus* vigilantes.’<sup>2</sup>

Peter of Palma (the next), in 1344, repeats almost the very words of Berengarius (*supra*).

Simon Lingonensis (the next General but two) writes, in 1359: ‘Nulla vigiliarum inutilis sit protractio nocturnarum, quibus *est impositum* vigilare cum Christo.’

Shortly after this, the Encyclical Letters, as edited by Father Reichert, come to an end. We are confronted, moreover, with further difficulties, in the shape of the loss, sometimes partial, sometimes entire, of both the letters of the Generals and the different *Acta* themselves. There is, however, one more important extract which must be quoted. Bl. Raymund of Capua, the twenty-third General, who endeavoured to restore the Order to its primitive fervour, must certainly have insisted upon mental prayer. An examination of available evidence (by no means exhaustive on my part, it is true) did not, however, reveal any very explicit reference to the subject. But a few years later, viz., in 1434, the General, Bartholomew Texerii, carrying on Bl. Raymund’s work, exhorts the brethren: ‘Estote germani imitatores patris Dominici, et sanctimoniam cum sobrietate scrutantes *secretarum orationum* in primis arma, et sacrorum voluminum exercitia capiat.’<sup>3</sup>

We now come to the first ordination, on the matter of mental prayer, made by a *General Chapter*.

1. In the Acts of the Chapter at Milan in 1505, we read: ‘Post completorium fratres stent in oratione per spacium septem psalmorum’ (Ordination 1).<sup>4</sup>

But, *pace* Father Poulain, this ordination was not a change, still less an innovation. For notice, first, the use of the very words of Bl. Humbert—*stando* and *stent*, in *oratione*, and for the length of time of the *septem psalmorum*.<sup>5</sup> With regard to this last expression, many examples might be quoted to show that it probably meant the ‘*psalmi septem et litania*’—not that it would affect the argument, if it did not. We speak of the *Salve* procession, meaning the *Salve* and *O Lumen*; we say that Complin is longer

<sup>1</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> *Monumenta O.P.*, Acta III., ed. Reichert; Rome, 1900. Italics mine.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. iv. (1901).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *supra*, pp. 185 and 187.



on Saturdays on account of Our Lady's Litany, meaning the litany *and* the sung antiphon, etc. So here, *spacium septem psalmorum* may have been but the generic term for expressing the time which it would take to chant the traditional *psalmi septem et litania*. For, secondly, to come to the important point, anyone who reads this ordination (of the General Chapter of 1505) in full, will see at once that it was no *new* practice which was here ordained, no extra devotion, or form of devotion, *added on*; for he will see that the ordination was nothing more than a reminder of what may indeed have been forgotten or at least neglected, but of what, nevertheless, had always been the rule. The ordination reminds the brethren how to go to choir when the signal for the Office has been sounded; how they were to say, or rather sing, that Office in its entirety; how they were to make the inclinations, keep the pause in the middle of the verse, and stand with hands under their scapulars; how they were to say the *Salve Regina* after all the Hours, and sing it solemnly in procession after Complin, as well as one antiphon as they returned to the choir—not a single one of which things they did not know, and should not have been observing before. And it is in the same breath with all this, nay, *in the same sentence*, that they are incidentally reminded of the duty of mental prayer after Complin—the sung *Salve* first, of course, and then one other antiphon, 'que in revertendo ad chorum dici debet, *et post completorium fratres stent in oratione per spacium septem psalmorum.*' This is how the ordination ends; and only those who have never read it, and who know nothing of the rules and customs of the Order, could assert that here we have a change and an innovation, and the first introduction of what we now call mental prayer.

2. Ordination 3 of the General Chapter of 1569 deals with mental prayer expressly. 'Ordinamus et observari omnino volumus, ut post completorium toto anni tempore fratres stent in communi oratione per spatium unius mediae horae vel circa'—a new ordination indeed, but one in which not a single new departure is revealed, save the more modern method of reckoning time.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is this ordination, and the evidence in the one which follows, which incline me to believe that the time indicated by the Penitential Psalms and litany must have been equivalent to nearly half-an-hour; because, for a community, if not a choral, duty, Bl. Humbert would, I think, have been speaking in terms of *sung* Office and litanies, as also would the Chapter of 1505.

3. In the next Chapter, in 1571, Ordination 2 runs<sup>as</sup> follows: 'Item, post completorium et post nonam vel matutinas *de more nostri Ordinis* semper habeatur oratio privata, quae ad minimum per quartam horae durare debeat.' This is interesting for two reasons especially. The *post nonam* seems to indicate that there had been a tendency at times not to have mental prayer first thing in the morning, but to postpone it even until the afternoon (cf. footnote below). Secondly, too much stress, I think, cannot be laid upon the words *de more nostri Ordinis*. Such a phrase is not lightly used, nor the custom indicated lightly introduced. This shows us, too, how unsafe it is to place much reliance upon negative arguments, and upon the absence of the record of a thing in official documents. Until this ordination, there is not a single word in any *Acta* about mental prayer in the morning, i.e., after None or Matins; yet here, quite unexpectedly, we have the custom of the Order authoritatively appealed to.

4. Lastly, in the next General Chapter, in 1574, we read in Confirmation 16: 'Item, confirmamus illam ordinationem videlicet quod post completorium et post nonam vel matutinas *de more nostri Ordinis* habeatur oratio privata secretaque et maxime mentalis, quae ad minimum per quartam horae durare debeat'—in which we may note especially that the prayer, albeit private, is a community exercise, and that secret prayer is mental.<sup>1</sup>

Now, to come to the particular point at issue—the supposed influence of the Jesuit system. St. Ignatius did not himself introduce mental prayer. We may trust Father Poulain's accuracy, at least upon this point. He says that

as soon as a man entered the Society, he [St. Ignatius] made him follow the *Exercises* in silence for a month. Afterwards the obligatory morning prayer consisted solely in half-an-hour of vocal prayer and the recitation of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. The professed religious

<sup>1</sup> Far from there being twelve successive General Chapters which legislated about Mental Prayer, a gap of nearly forty years occurred after that of 1574. It is not until 1611 (1601 is a misprint in our Constitution) that we find the next notice. It will be of sufficient interest to quote, though it does not enter into, nor affect, the theses under discussion, on account of its comparatively late date: 'Confirmamus et in toto Ordine inviolabiliter observari mandamus, quod alias pluries ordinatum fuit, ut bis in die post completorium, vespas et matutinas tempore hyemis aut post nonam tempore aestatis habeatur in choro communiter mentalis oratio per dimidia saltem singulis vicibus horae spatium vel circa . . . consuetudinibus tamen Provinciarum, quae saluberrimo huic exercitio, longiori temporis spatio, vacare consueverunt prorsus inviolatis' (Conf. 32).



were only invited in a general way to concentrate the largest possible part of their free time to prayer. This custom *lasted for thirty years*; and then mental prayer was *gradually* introduced.<sup>1</sup>

Now, the Society of Jesus was founded in 1534, so that it was not until 1564, at the earliest, that any system of daily mental prayer even *began* to be introduced in it. Thus, the Acts of Dominican General Chapters from which I have quoted, namely, those of 1505, 1569, 1571, and 1574, may all be said to have been published before there can have been any real question of Jesuit influence in this matter at all.

How true, then, was all that the General, Nicholas Ridolfi, wrote in the seventeenth century with regard to mental prayer in the Order of St. Dominic; how accurate the estimate and judgment of later Generals; and how purely have Dominican traditions upon this point been handed down in the legislation to be found in the modern Constitutions.

RAYMUND DEVAS, O.P.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 40. Italics mine.

# DR. MURRAY OF MAYNOOTH

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY

## IV

DURING all his years as a professor, Dr. Murray was in weak health, aggravated by climate and sedentary work. But, bravely, he worked on, studying, arranging his lectures, writing essays for several periodicals, aiding Duffy with his publications, going off from college, weak and worn, returning, greatly improved and full of hope and energy. The long vacation in summer, 1849, did not rest or revive him much. And on his return he had such serious attacks of illness that his relatives and his colleagues were alarmed. Should he recover he must leave the college, they said, and when his illness became alarming they resolved that he must take a long holiday, at least. Things went from bad to worse, the doctors said he was sinking rapidly and he made his will. He was a man of frugal habit, but full of charity and generosity, so that in his will, made on the 10th September, 1849, and witnessed by George Crolly and Matthew Kelly—he had no money to bequeath, and he bequeaths his books to be sold in London, ‘as they would bring a much higher price there,’ and his round table, his set of tables, easy chair, desk, pictures, candlesticks, to be sold to pay some little debts. The testator rallied, grew strong, took his classes and lived for more than thirty years.

During the next few years he had many sorrows. His brother, Father Edward, was dying in Dublin, after years of illness. Amongst Dr. Murray’s letters are two, pinned together—one tells him that the writer is dying and to say Mass daily for him. No need to remind such a kind and loving brother of such a pious duty. The other letter reads:—

SATURDAY.

DEAR FATHER McCABE,—Exhausted and weak after a bad week, I would wish to see you some time during the day.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD MURRAY.



This was written the Saturday before his death, August 21, 1851. Father McCabe, in later days, became Cardinal McCabe, and was present at the funeral of Dr. Murray in 1882. The grief of the Murray family was very deep and long felt, as their old faded letters show very plainly.

During the early years of his life as professor Murray read much. Not only (as his little old note-books show) did he read the text books, and the classic authors of his professional subject, but he read a vast amount of sacred and profane literature, in Latin, English, French, Italian and German. He and his Maynooth colleagues were, like Brougham and the early *Edinburgh Reviewers*, 'cultivating genius on a little' oatmeal.' And the systematic reading made him a cultured, well-informed man, so that socially he discussed subjects with great ability, and in his intercourse with men of culture and learning was a credit to his college and his calling. At several social gatherings in Dublin, Mr. O'Hagan (afterwards Lord O'Hagan) records his pleasure from the able and learned manner that Russell, Murray, and Crolly conversed with the trained legal minds and with the Oxford converts, who were professors in the ill-starred Catholic University. It was this reading gift that helped to make him such a fine essayist and interesting professor. He was not content to rattle the dry bones of the text book to his class. But he tried to interest his pupils—to teach them that

The Church is the poet of her children, full of music to soothe the sad and control the wayward; wonderful in story for the imagination of the romantic, rich in symbol and imagery, so that gentle and delicate feelings, which will not bear words, may in silence intimate their presence or commune with themselves. Her very being is poetry. Every psalm, every petition, every collect, every versicle, the cross, the mitre, the thurible, is a fulfilment of some dream of childhood or aspiration of youth.

During this period of his career Father Murray preached and lectured quite a number of times in different parts of Ireland, set charity sermons, Sunday sermons in the town and country churches where he found himself on holiday or supplying for another priest, lectures to Catholic Associations in Drogheda, Dublin, Cork. I have been at pains to write to more than a dozen of his former pupils and everyone speaks of his splendid reading in class, his musical voice, his dramatic power. And the writer of his obituary notice,

who was probably his colleague, Dr. John Healy, says that his sermons were fine specimens of pulpit oratory. Murray used to relate that once, when preaching, he said, 'a word and I am done,' and a pious crone replied audibly 'May you niver be done, you darlin'.' And the same old dame was pained when she heard that he had to go to 'larn' (Larne) to preach!

In class, he used to read for his pupils selections from Dryden's *Hind and Panther*, to illustrate the doctrines of the indefectibility, unity, sanctity of the Church; little pieces from Shakespeare and Milton to express Catholic doctrine. His old class note-books give the references to these poets. But his Irish pupils remember best the readings from his favourite fiction writer, Dickens. He read to amuse them and to instruct them, to urge them to read; to be reading men would save them from many dangers, would solace their long lonely nights. And Dickens, with his everlasting fun, his Pickwick and Weller, Mantilini, Cuttle, Codlin and Short, would be a refresher to many a sunless, dreary soul. Everyone of his old pupils remembers his Dickens reading, and many an old set of Dickens, on priests' shelves, was bought, through the love begotten of Father Murray's reading.

To the students, as the obituary notice says, he was kind, courteous, patient and not 'hard.' He was, too, they say, their friend and ally in college troubles, he was confessor to many and helped many to decide the question of to be or not to be—vocation. But he was never lax or slack. Easy and free, but not free and easy, as intruders and the ill-mannered and over-familiar experienced. For he was not universally popular or by all beloved. Who is? A sharp letter from a Bishop reprimands him for being instrumental in removing from the college a blue-blooded blockhead, 'the nephew of the Dean of this diocese . . . perhaps his uncle's opposition to your friends, Duffy, Mitchel and O'Brien, may have something to say to your decision.' Murray replied from Whitehall Street, Clones, 'May it please your Lordship, I never expelled a student from this college. That is the business of the college council, which acts upon the cumulative reports of professors.' And he adds, in pencil, on the Bishop's angry letter, 'this young man got bad reports from every professor for two consecutive years. He cannot translate the text books.' One would think that vicarious weeding out should delight a prelate. But some people like to do their own weeding,



and this young man's name did not long remain in the clerical directory. But, he did not die but lived to vindicate the college decision and, alas ! to shame his calling by apostasy.

The polite reference to Murray's friends, Duffy, Mitchel, and O'Brien, bears on Murray's action in the State Trials of 1844, when O'Connell, Duffy and others were imprisoned. Murray adored O'Connell, loved Duffy, and as a priest of his diocese was in the dock with them he took a keen, practical, priestly interest in the trial. Probably it had been wiser to be colourless and silent, but it is hard to be ever and always silent and neutral. Silence often is cowardice, and what is known as 'prudence' is more accurately labelled 'poltroonery.' The remnants of these Young Irelanders were, according to Newman, the only thinking people he met in Dublin, and perhaps Murray thought the same. Perhaps patriotism stirred the little priest from the wee bigoted Ulster town. Perhaps prudence and charity whispered the advice to not let young men drift away from the Church for want of a sympathetic word from a learned priest. But Murray suffered for his friendship and his help :—

But one man, who had never written in newspapers and rarely read them, brought the force of a powerful and unjaded intellect to the controversy and burned the facts into the public mind [the fact of jury packing]. Dr. Murray, Professor of Theology in Maynooth, in a series of letters signed 'An Irish Priest,'<sup>1</sup>

influenced public opinion [as anonymous letters had scarcely done since the Drapier's. He addressed them to the Attorney-General, and separating himself from the opinions of Young Ireland which he did not share, and from any personal ill-will to the man which he did not feel, on the ground common to both of them of an Irish Catholic liberal, overwhelmed him with shame and scorn.

If it should be believed by Englishmen [wrote Dr. Murray] that the complaint of packed juries was the clamour of rebels, it may be useful to remind them that the very Ministers in Office, when these things were done, had themselves denounced the system four years earlier, when they were in Opposition. Speaking of the jury in O'Connell's case, Lord John Russell said : 'Ten Roman Catholics and two Liberal Protestants were struck out by the Solicitor of the Crown. It does, Sir, appear to me that such a fact of itself deprives the whole of the proceedings of any weight or value.' In the same debate Sir George Gray said : 'The trial—a trial of Catholics—took place in a country, seven-eighths of the population of

<sup>1</sup> Gavan Duffy, *Young Ireland*.

which were Roman Catholics and yet not one Catholic could be found qualified to sit on the jury, who were to try the issue—not one whose sympathies were not enlisted with the traversers, not one who was considered a safe man to trust with the investigation of the crime of which the accused stood charged.<sup>1</sup>

Of the Castle Press, Dr. Murray wrote :—

Three times a week these full and fetid jaws were opened to vomit forth such abominable slanders as modest men could sometimes hardly read without a blush and timid men without a shudder. If a convent were sacked in one place and its inmates violated—if a church were desecrated in another place—if in another place a man's brains were dashed out or his throat cut—if anywhere some blasphemy uttered or some organized plunder advanced—if there occurred an anti-social commotion amongst the *canaille* of the *faubourgs* or clubs of Paris, straightway these men, locked in jail, were marked as the men who designed to introduce the same system and enact the same horrors in Ireland ; straightway the Castle witch sent forth a direful howl and stretched forth her long, brown, skinny arms to protect the altars and the homes of Irishmen from the demon assaults of Irishmen, from the demon assaults of Duffy, Meagher, and the rest. The effect produced was tremendous. The belief became very general among the readers of the Orange papers and the *Evening Post* that such must be the facts regarding the prisoner ; they were stated so confidently, so circumstantially, so constantly.

The extract repeated here reads as history repeating itself.

In 1850 Murray published the *Irish Annual Miscellany*, which afterwards was renamed *Essays* and extended to four volumes. These volumes contain some of Murray's very best work and preserve it in a permanent form. Seeing that some flowerets of Eden we still inherit, but that the trail of the serpent is over them all, that English prose was mainly pagan and anti-Catholic in tone, he tried in his essays to put before Catholics, Catholic ideals and ideas. Catholics had no guiding works in English and the constant reading of anti-Catholic and non-Catholic books and the arguments and conversations of educated Protestants weakened and often destroyed the faith of Catholic business and professional men. Murray set out to state facts, to reason logically, to put before Catholics true, solid arguments of defence. For, as he notes, zealous defenders of Catholic principles and faith adopted unworthy methods, lying arguments and outlandish claims. Hence he treats of 'State Endowments of the Catholic Church,' 'Macaulay, Pascal and the Jesuits,' 'A Night in an Orange Lodge,' 'Convents,' 'The Political Rights of Clergy,' 'Equivocation,'

<sup>1</sup> Gavan Duffy, *Young Ireland*.



'The Primacy of Peter,' 'The Right of Resistance to the Supreme Civil Power,' 'The Christian Priesthood,' 'Catholic Claims in Education,' 'Sir Francis Head and Maynooth College,' etc. All his essays show thought, good logic, Murray's eminent characteristic, clearness and exactitude of treatment, and occasionally—vehemence, and, as he laments, a little bitterness.

His very first essay deals with a then raging controversy amongst the clergy, the State payment of priests. Priests were very poor and a beneficent State, which built and endowed a national college, paid its professors and its students, wished to endow Irish priests, to pay them a salary and to relieve them of care and woes unnumbered. The State had enlisted splendid writers and a good Press to urge its kindly and thoughtful scheme; Sydney Smith and Arnold and a host of others worked constantly and eloquently to influence English lay and Irish clerical opinion. Many priests favoured the proposals, many opposed them. Rome could not understand the Irish clergy. They were divided on the political Union of the Kingdoms, on the Veto, on the National Schools, on the Queen's Colleges and on the proposal to endow the priesthood. It is hard to understand the Irish. Even in the summer of 1916 English newspapers wept because the Catholic priests of Ireland were not paid by State endowment. Sixty years before that date Professor Murray explained to the Reverend, the Very Reverend and the Most Reverend Clergy of Ireland—then in debate, hot and heavy—that State endowment could bring no blessing but must bring evil, lasting and irrevocable toils and fetters.

Lord Francis Egerton, in 1825, carried a Bill through the House of Commons (afterwards thrown out by the Lords) to pay the Irish Roman Catholic priests the following salaries from the treasury:—

|  |   |          |
|--|---|----------|
| 1,000 Parish Priests ; 200 at £200, 800 at £120  | . | £136,000 |
| 1,000 Curates at £60                             | . | 60,000   |
| 4 Archbishops at £1,500                          | . | 6,000    |
| 22 Bishops at £1,000                             | . | 22,000   |
| 30 Deans at £300                                 | . | 9,000    |
| Towards a Roman Catholic Lay or Clerical College | . | 17,000   |
|  |   | <hr/>    |
|  |   | £250,000 |

But although the Irish Catholic Bishops on January 11, 1837, November 9, 1841, November 15, 1843, strongly

declared they would not accept State salaries, the Government persisted in their kind offers and were not lacking in spokesmen and supporters amongst the clergy and laity. Meetings and conferences debated the subject and the Maynooth professor wrote against the proposal.

The systems of rattling the collecting box at the church door, of pew rents, of house to house collection or haggling and wheedling over sixpences and shillings are not ideal, said the professor :—

I am well aware of the extent to which the enemies of the Church have exaggerated and invented in this matter, and of the purpose to which these inventions and exaggerations have been turned. But if they lie, whose very theological creed has been mainly framed and supported on a falsification of ours, that is no reason we should lie too. If there are certain defects and inconveniences in the financial economy of our Church, which in no way reach its spiritual economy, they have caused, who now ridicule them. If dirt sticks to the outer walls of the sanctuary, they have flung it there who point the finger at it. They seized upon the riches bequeathed by ancient piety for the support and dignity of religion, and transferred them to a band of alien robbers, who knew not the people as the people knew not them; and now they laugh and shout in derision over the desolation their own hands have wrought and the effects of it. They seated a harlot in the triumphal car and chained the spouse of Christ to its wheels, and then mock her bleeding countenance and torn garments. They crowned her with thorns and spat upon her face and then say there is no beauty or comeliness in her. But her beauty is from within and shines out, as a soul speaks, through a worn and furrowed countenance.

No slave wrote this piece of Macaulay-like prose. Some feared that the clergy might grow too rich!

In some places not a few of your ardent lip-lovers of the Church, your admirers of penniless priests, comfortable and independent themselves, with a considerable annual surplus, think it an excess of generosity to give yearly ten or twenty shillings to the clergy, and this too, after two or three rounds of 'not at home' and 'call again.' They look grave and inquisitive and dark-browed and take large note if they hear that the priest of the parish has an excellent dinner every day. And no one needs a good dinner or deserves it better, for the hard-working Irish missionaries are amongst the most hard-working men in the world.

Then he deals with the false analogy made between the clergy of Protestant England and the Irish priests, with the argument about priests having a horse and the Bishops with a carriage and the Apostles who trudged from land to land. State endowment of the Church is a very desirable thing. But is the State endowment of the Catholic Church in Ireland by an English Government a desirable thing



The professor answered emphatically, *negative*. For many attempts, ancient and modern, of English rule have been made to subordinate the Church to Government's wishes and ways. Some unprincipled rulers stopped at nothing to gain a substantial influence in Irish Catholic affairs. When the pension had been paid freely, exactly, punctually, for ten or twenty years the Government might begin gently to meddle in affairs Catholic. Look at Portugal and its Church. But why, said the countless upholders of State endowment, allow Maynooth College, its staff of professors and its students, to be endowed and State paid and deny this boon to parish priests and curates? O learned professors, are you alone of the Irish clergy to be safely trusted with the gold of the Consolidated Fund?

There is no parity. The professors are paid as teachers and are free to resign their positions at any time and they cease to be State servants. A score of clergymen are obliged to wear a dumb bell fastened to their necks, as long as they reside within certain precincts, which precincts they may abandon whenever they please and thus regain their freedom.

The essay is an interesting page in Irish Church History, and in exposing and combating the danger Dr. Murray deserves great credit for his courage and ability. Their extreme poverty led priests and people almost to agree to temporary endowment, endowment for ten years, endowment in certain districts. That essay warns all of the dangerous fetters, so bright and so binding as State aid must prove, in a Catholic country held by a pagan one.

Dr. Murray dedicated his essay to Thomas O'Hagan, afterwards Lord O'Hagan, his close personal friend. Indeed it was O'Hagan and Duffy who were urging constantly the Maynooth staff to write on the burning questions of the day. The weak type of Catholic, the Catholic in name only, the hostile Catholic, the apostate, in O'Hagan's view, were such, through ignorance, want of religious knowledge, want of guiding Catholic literature. Alas! these types very often have too much knowledge and too many guides. His volumes were much prized, had a huge sale, and even yet, as the booksellers' lists show, are sought for, and scarce.

In the early fifties the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was much written of and studied. Signs were not wanting that the doctrine, which was a subject of dispute between the Dominicans and Franciscans for centuries, was to be dealt with finally by Papal authority, and the allies of each contending school wrote much. The

doctrine was of very old standing in Ireland, where the first feast in honour of Mary Immaculate was established in the eighth century.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Crolly had written two essays on the theme for *Duffy's Magazine*, Dr. Russell's muse formed a sonnet in praise of Mary Immaculate, and the homely muse of Dr. Murray sang sweetly of the Rose without a thorn. The Maynooth professors taught their pupils the doctrine in class and in sermon. But Maynooth College is like heaven, a place of many mansions. And many of its mansions are unknown or untrodden by college students. The glorious Passalgia was toiling in Rome to amass literature in favour of the doctrine which was to be defined. The opinion of all great colleges was sought. The letter of query to Maynooth arrived in the first days of August and found forty or sixty students spending their holidays there, shepherded by two shepherds. The letter was not seen by the superiors or the theological faculty. It had gone to the ironmongery department and was replied to by a crank, who declared that Maynooth did not believe the doctrine was one to be defined!

Did Scotus—whom Dr. Crolly claimed to be an Ulster man—turn in his grave in the sanctuary of Cologne Cathedral? Did his ashes vivify and seek for his habit and cord to return to his land in anger and shame? There was no need. The Maynooth professors were quickly summoned, were pained and grieved, and hastened to reply for their college. One of them was very angry, and a letter shows that the professor from Clones believed in the prayer of the old and historic *Clones Missal*: 'It is truly meet and just to implore Thy Majesty with suppliant minds, that being appeased by the supplication of the ever blessed and *unblemished* Virgin Mary, Thou wouldst grant pardon for all our sins and perpetual remedies.'<sup>2</sup> But Professor Murray was angry. *O tantae irae in caelestibus.*

E. J. QUIGLEY.

*To be continued.]*

<sup>1</sup>Vide 'The Irish Origin of Our Lady's Feast of the Immaculate Conception,' by Father Thurston, S.J. *The Month* (May and June, 1904.)

<sup>2</sup>*Clones Missal*, tenth century.



# PERFECT CONTRITION

By 'A MISSIONARY PRIEST'

A MISSIONARY priest cannot too often refresh his knowledge of the Church's teaching on the all-important subject of Perfect Contrition. It is regrettable, then, that the usual manuals of Moral Theology do not make his work easier by bringing together in one chapter or in one section the many points of the doctrine and of its application which at present are to be found scattered here and there in different places or in different volumes. The treatises on Dogmatic Theology are no better: and of course, from the nature of the case, they are more concerned with the proof of doctrine than with its application. It is desirable, then, to have the subject treated in order and continuously.

Possibly it is a presumptuous and an unnecessary undertaking; for surely every priest has made it one of the studies of his life to thoroughly understand, and one of the efforts of his life to frequently and clearly explain to others, the value of this extraordinary treasure of the Church, which it is his privilege to share and his duty to dispense. Presumptuous it may be, and unnecessary I hope it is; still the importance of the subject and the desirability of connected treatment induce me to attempt another setting of the gem—a setting which, I pray, may be worthy of it, or which may at least help us to appreciate it more.

## I—NATURE AND QUALITIES OF PERFECT CONTRITION

Contrition, in general, is defined by the Council of Trent as 'a heartfelt sorrow and detestation of sin committed, with a firm purpose of sinning no more.' We must examine this definition: and a little psychology is inevitable—but a little will suffice. Sorrow and detestation are acts of the will. Though distinguished in the definition, they are hardly separable in actual life. To detest sin means to hate it strongly, to loathe it, to execrate it, to turn away

from it, to wish it had never been committed. Sorrow, or *dolor*, adds to this revulsion the feeling of uneasiness and discomfort and actual pain experienced on considering that this detestable sin, is here and now, actually present on the soul.

Again, the will is a 'blind faculty'—*nihil volitum nisi praeognitum*. By its nature the will is free in its choice of action; but it is dependent on the intellect for a knowledge of the alternatives. The will does not love or hate a thing except when the intellect provides such knowledge and such light as will give a motive for love or hatred. If, therefore, the will is to hate sin and be sorry for it, it can do so only when the intellect has provided a knowledge of the evil and malice of sin—it is of vital importance to grasp this fact at the outset. On consideration the intellect observes several malices, several evils in sin. The will may use any of these as a motive for hating sin; according to the motive from which it acts we have the two-fold division of contrition into perfect and imperfect contrition.

Perfect contrition is a heartfelt sorrow and detestation of sin, above every other evil, because it offends God Who is good in Himself, with a firm resolution not to offend God any more, to satisfy for our sins, and to go to confession. Imperfect contrition is sorrow for sin for any other supernatural motive less than that of perfect contrition.

We are concerned with perfect contrition only; and the most important part of its definition is that which says that the motive or reason for our sorrow must be 'because it offends God Who is good in Himself.' This is the highest and the best motive, which it is absolutely necessary to reach in order to have perfect contrition.

Next in importance is the intention of going to confession. In theory, at any rate, this is a very important condition, for the reason that God has instituted one necessary means of getting rid of mortal sin, and one only, namely, the sacrament of Penance. There is no independent means of pardon. Contrition, then, is not perfect, and will not remit mortal sin unless it contains the intention of receiving this sacrament—of submitting 'to the keys' the mortal sins not yet submitted. To deliberately omit this intention makes an act of perfect contrition impossible of accomplishment; to form the intention now and to withdraw it afterwards, or to refuse to carry it out, will not,



indeed, cause the former sins to revive, but will constitute a new and a mortal sin of disobedience to God's Law. In practice, however, theologians advise us not to worry over this condition of perfect contrition, because an implicit intention will suffice, and such an intention will almost certainly be present when one acts from the high motive of perfect contrition. They even go so far as to say that in practice this condition will always be fulfilled, and on this score our contrition be perfect, unless we formally resolve *not* to confess our sins later on, when opportunity offers.

A somewhat similar condition is contained in 'the resolution not to offend God seriously again.' This is the ordinary *propositum* of all contrition, which, though very important in itself, does not require further treatment here. The remainder of the definition implies what theologians set down as the necessary *qualities* of contrition. It must be—(1) Internal, true sorrow; (2) it must be supernatural; (3) it must be supreme (*appreciative summa*); (4) it must be universal.

(1) The meaning and necessity of the first quality is obvious. Our sorrow must be actual and real, and present in the heart or will and not on our lips merely.

(2) Sorrow must be supernatural in two ways—in principle and in motive. A study of the theology of Grace makes this apparent. Later on we will see that an act of perfect contrition remits sin, secures justification, is meritorious of eternal life. Now, no act of unaided human nature can have such effects; there must be proportion between cause and effect. Human effort, therefore, must be elevated and assisted by Divine Grace—and in this way the principle (or the source and origin) of the act becomes supernatural. In practice we do our part when we pray properly for this necessary grace or Divine assistance; and we may rest confident that God will not fail to do His part and to grant our request. The motive also must be supernatural for a similar reason; and this means that human motives or reasons for sorrow, mere 'natural' considerations, are of no avail, they are disproportionate to the effect. In the case of perfect contrition it means that we accept our knowledge of the fact that God is good in Himself from Faith and Revelation, and not from human reason.

(3) Sorrow for sin must be supreme, of the highest kind, *appreciative*. In other words, we must realize that the evil

of sin altogether outweighs, and is of a different class from, all other misfortunes ; and that in comparison with sin, and considering the only true interests of man, all other misfortunes are negligible. This condition, however, does not require us to *feel* more sorrow for sin than for those misfortunes ; it does not require the sorrow to be *intensive summa*—of the greatest intensity.

(4) Lastly, our sorrow must be universal, must extend to each and all our mortal sins. Here again we need not enter into detail ; for we are considering perfect contrition only, and its motive is universal in the technical sense, and assures the presence of this condition of sorrow.

To sum up then : perfect contrition is sorrow for sin because it offends God Who is good in Himself. It must contain the intention of going to confession should one be in mortal sin, and in any case the resolution not to offend God grievously again ; and it must have the four qualities I have explained.

## II—HOW TO ELICIT AN ACT OF PERFECT CONTRITION

In this section I intend to be as practical and as brief as possible—and I believe that by attending carefully to two things, one can secure all the conditions I have mentioned ; and one may, without great difficulty, perform a true act of perfect contrition.

In the first place we must remember that an act of contrition is a supernatural act, and that our unaided effort cannot possibly elicit it. The grace or assistance of God is absolutely necessary, and this will be infallibly given when we ask it properly. The first thing to do then is, in our own words, or in some set form of prayer, to earnestly and fervently beg of God the grace which is necessary. There is no use in attempting the impossible—therefore, *first of all, prayer.*

Again, I emphasized the psychological principle *nihil volitum nisi praeognitum*—the fact that the will does not love or hate until the intellect has provided the knowledge or the motive necessary for the will's love or hatred. Our second effort then must be to convince the intellect of the evil and malice of sin, and—in the case of perfect contrition—its malice in offending God Who is good in Himself. Once the intellect is convinced of this, the detestation and sorrow of the will follows—freely, of course, but, considering our mental constitution, we may say, certainly.



Our object is, then (and our second duty), to convince the intellect of the malice of sin inasmuch as it offends God Who is good in Himself. In practice it is more advisable not to aim at this, the highest motive of sorrow, straight away. It is much better to consider some of the lesser motives first, and gradually to work up to the perfect motive.

I must remark here that the several motives of sorrow make an unequal impression on different individuals; and I strongly advise each person to use that particular motive which makes the strongest appeal to himself, and which convinces him best of the malice of sin. At the same time, 'the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom,' and most people may, with profit, consider, in the first place, some of the punishments God has meted out to sin. The greatest of these, of course, is Hell. One should ponder slowly over the nature of this punishment: its essence—the pain of loss; its chief accompaniment—the several pains of sense; its intensity; its duration. One should ask, next, how this becomes a practical, a personal possibility for oneself? Our Faith supplies the answer: by mortal sin alone. This brings home to us the meaning and the malice of mortal sin. But the argument becomes more forcible and the conviction more firm when we consider, further, Who it is that inflicts this dreadful punishment, and why? It is God, our Father, our best friend, Who takes the greatest interest in us, Who loves us with an everlasting love, Who has prepared for us a different eternity, an eternity of happiness with Himself in Heaven. Surely there must be the strongest reason for this changed attitude. What has turned our best friend into a relentless enemy? Again, it is mortal sin. It is the malicious and grievous insult and offence which mortal sin offers Him. There is no other explanation.

I know of no consideration which, in all circumstances, begets in us such a lively conviction of the malice of mortal sin, and such a corresponding detestation and horror of it, as this, of setting on one side the infinite mercy and love of God, and on the other the eternal punishment of Hell.

But we must not stop here if we wish to reach perfect contrition. The next consideration I recommend is, that this grievous sin offends God *Who is so good to us* (and I hope to show that the transition is easy from this motive to that

of perfect sorrow—‘because sin offends God Who is good in Himself’). We feel and show gratitude to earthly benefactors. To whom do we owe so much as to God? Whatever we are, or have, or shall be, to Him we owe it all. Possibly we are blessed with temporal goods; probably we are blessed with at least normal faculties of mind and body; certainly we are richly blessed with spiritual favours. We are Christians, purchased by the blood of Christ. We are made, in a sense, partakers of His Divine nature, and co-heirs to an eternal kingdom. We are Catholics, endowed with the true faith, enriched with all possible helps and graces to secure our salvation. We owe all this to God. And besides these general favours, how much does each individual owe Him for special graces and blessings? To mention just one: if you ever committed a mortal sin you owe it to God’s patience and mercy that you are not now in Hell.

But who can enumerate all His blessings to us! Calmly think them over, some of them. Wonder at their variety, their multiplicity. Dwell on those that strike you most, and be convinced, as you must, of God’s goodness to you. Then ask yourself what return you have made, at least what gratitude you have shown. Have you sinned grievously? We saw and tried to measure, by its punishment, what sin means to God; and that is what you offer Him in return for all His goodness to you! Surely, shame and regret and sorrow should be easy in the light of these considerations.

The last step: God has been good to us. Why? Is it because we deserved it, because we had some claims or merits to put forward in our behalf? Of course not—if for no other reason than that many of these blessings were conferred before we were capable of meriting; and, in any case, because we can never merit without His grace. No, the reason and explanation of God’s goodness to us is not to be found in us, it must be sought in God Himself; and it is, that God is good in Himself. That is the explanation and cause of His goodness to us. So our faith assures us—and we accept this truth, as we did that of the other motives of sorrow, from Revelation. However, to make the truth real and living and practical for ourselves, we must study it, meditate on it, carefully and calmly reflect on it, as we did on the other motives. And, fortunately, we have not to consider this goodness in the abstract, we have it in the



concrete, in the Divine Person of the Incarnate God, Jesus Christ. To His Sacred Heart (present on our altars, too) we attribute all His blessings, His goodness to us; and guided by the light of faith we trace the reason of this kindness to us to His goodness in Himself—*actio sequitur esse*. He is good in Himself; He is infinite goodness and kindness and charity—and yet we offend and insult Him by sin! We are heartily sorry now, we detest sin, we resolve never to commit it again, and we are prepared to do anything He may appoint (confession, satisfaction, etc.). This is perfect contrition: perfect because it is disinterested, because there is nothing selfish about it. Even if there were no Heaven or no Hell, or no other motive of sorrow, still we would be sorry for this motive that we have offended Jesus Christ Who is good in Himself, Who is infinite goodness and kindness and charity.

Because of, at least, the association of the two ideas, or, it may be, the essential connexion of the two subjects, it may be well, before passing on, to say a brief word about an act of equal efficacy to that of perfect contrition, namely, an act of the perfect love of God. In analysing the act of perfect contrition, we saw that in practice it is based on perfect charity. At confession, however, our contrition must be *formal*, must have explicit reference to sin committed. What is called equivalent contrition, that is, contrition included in an act of the pure love of God, is not sufficient disposition for the sacrament. It is disputed whether, outside the sacrament, explicit reference to sin actually present on the soul is necessary for its remission; but, again, in practice it is considered psychologically certain that in such a case the mind will, without any effort even, always reckon with existing sin.

In order to elicit an act of the perfect love of God—and to secure the consequent extraordinary results—the same processes of prayer and consideration of motives will suffice as I have described above, with the difference that in this case the first consideration may be omitted.

### III—EFFECTS OF AN ACT OF PERFECT CONTRITION

It is when we come to consider the marvellous effects of perfect contrition that we realize its importance and necessity in certain cases, and its utility in any circumstances.

(1) The first effect which I shall mention is at once

the most important, and, I may say, the most tangible, the easiest to grasp and realize, and it may be stated in a very few words: an act of true perfect contrition remits immediately all the mortal sins on a man's soul. In other words, it brings about justification; it is meritorious of 'eternal life.' It does not matter how long that person has lived in sin, it does not matter how numerous or how malicious his sins have been—even if he were the greatest sinner that ever lived—yet the moment he elicits a genuine act of perfect contrition he gets pardon for all his sins, and if he were to die then he would be saved.

We need not delay to prove this doctrine; it may be found in any manual of Catholic Theology. We need not consider here the light it throws on the possibility of salvation for those who were baptized, but sinned grievously and are outside the 'true fold.' There is, however, one practical aspect of it which cannot be too much emphasized. God has, again and again, warned us that 'we know not the day nor the hour' when He may summon us to judgment. His words will certainly be verified in some cases—in many cases—and possibly in our own case: the issue in question is eternity. The moral is obvious.

(2) Another effect of perfect contrition, consequent on the former, is that it restores lost merit. It is clear that if a man commits a mortal sin and dies unrepentant, he is lost, even though, before he sinned, he had lived a good life and performed many highly meritorious works; in other words, the merit of these good works is lost. If, however, he repents and makes an act of perfect contrition, the merit of his former good works will revive and will increase his 'crown of glory' for eternity.

(3) These first two effects concern a man in the state of mortal sin. Now, what effect has an act of perfect contrition in the case of a person already in the state of grace? The effect, of course, will be of a different kind, owing to the difference of their state of soul. In this latter case it takes the form of an *increase* of sanctifying grace, of merit, and of the 'title to glory.' The measure of this increase we cannot estimate, but we are safe in concluding that the effect, though differing in form, is at least as great in this case as in the former; and, with the theologians and spiritual writers, we may well marvel at the rich store of merit and reward which must be reserved for those who occasionally



or frequently make use of this golden key to the treasures of Heaven.

(4) Another effect of an act of perfect contrition is that it remits the temporal punishment due to sin after the sin itself is forgiven—that it shortens the time which, otherwise, one should spend in Purgatory.

(5) A last good effect (to which attention is rarely called) must result from acts of perfect contrition, inasmuch as the frequent consideration of the motives of perfect sorrow must beget a permanent conviction of these salutary truths, and thereby tone up the whole spiritual life; must give a man stability of character founded on an active consciousness of spiritual things and so provide him with an effective remedy against sinful impulses, unruly passions, and illusive temptations.

#### IV—NECESSITY OF PERFECT CONTRITION

Catholic Theology teaches that sorrow of some kind is necessary for the remission of every sin committed. It teaches also that with the sacrament of Penance imperfect contrition is sufficient to remit sin. The only case, then, in which perfect contrition is necessary is when it is impossible to receive the sacrament of Penance. In such a case perfect contrition (or, its equivalent in this respect, perfect charity), is the one and only means of getting rid of mortal sin; and, of course, if the impossibility of going to confession arises from a fatal illness, and a priest cannot arrive in time to give absolution, then the only hope of the sinner's salvation rests on his making an act of perfect contrition or perfect charity.

#### V—SOME PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS

(1) It is not my place, and besides there is no need to remind priests of their solemn duty of instructing their people frequently and carefully on the existence, efficacy, and necessity of acts of perfect contrition. I am convinced that all fairly well-instructed Catholics understand sufficiently this important doctrine. But I am very much afraid that many Catholics imagine it is a difficult thing to elicit a proper act of perfect contrition: in their simplicity or too great humility they seem to think that their poor efforts can never achieve such extraordinary results as follow from such an act. I think, therefore, that a greater

effort should be made to convince them that perfect contrition is not a luxury reserved for the 'elect,' that it is not beyond their power to elicit it, that it is not even difficult and that with a little practice it becomes quite easy. But someone will ask: 'How can it be easy? You spoke of the motive, of convincing the intellect, moving the will; you spoke of four qualities which are required; you said there must be an intention of going to confession and a *propositum* or resolution not to sin again. Now, surely the effort and the act which fulfils all these conditions cannot be easy?' Well, of course, I must still affirm that all these things are indeed necessary, and that if any one of them be absent, the contrition is not perfect; yet I contend, and I think I have already made good my contention, that in practice most of these conditions will be present without any effort at all—without even explicit reference to them—and I maintain that by attending to two things, and two only (and those not difficult), one can secure everything that is necessary to form an act of true perfect contrition.

Let us begin with the conditions of least importance in practice. Surely every Catholic knows that no contrition is possible without the resolution to avoid all mortal sins in the future. He knows, too, that perfect contrition is not independent of the one ordinary means of getting pardon for mortal sins, viz., the sacrament of Penance; he knows that all mortal sins must be confessed—and so, without any explicit reference to this obligation, his permanent consciousness of his duty in the case will supply the implicit intention which is required and is sufficient. Similarly, as we saw, three of the four qualities of contrition will create no difficulty; they, too, are necessary for even imperfect contrition, they introduce nothing new or unusual here: on the contrary, we might reasonably claim that the higher motive of perfect contrition makes it more certain that the sorrow will be *internal, supreme, and universal*, in the technical sense of these terms.

Though, therefore, I mention these conditions or qualities of perfect contrition—and they are necessary—still in practice there is no need to delay over them, no need to make explicit reference to them. Two things, however, do demand careful attention, but there are only two, they are not very difficult and they suffice. The first is to begin with fervent prayer to God for the grace of perfect contrition—



an easy condition to fulfil, but, for the reasons given, an absolutely essential one. The other is to use the motive of perfect contrition, viz., to be sorry for sin because it offends God Who is good in Himself. Our faith tells us that God is good in Himself, and that sin offends that good God. We accept these facts on faith and we impress them on ourselves, bring them home to ourselves, make them practical by consideration.

I emphasized, and insisted on, this latter point—the conviction of the intellect—because, on the one hand, I fear that a mere repetition of words of the act of perfect contrition will not beget that heartfelt sorrow and detestation of sin on the part of the will, which is the essence of contrition; and, on the other, because I believe (relying on psychology) that such conviction will naturally and certainly secure, as a sequel, this sorrow of the will. At the conscious risk of complicating somewhat the explanation of the mental process of contrition I distinguished ‘conviction of the intellect’ and ‘moving of the will’ (*nihil volutum nisi praeognitum*). I think it is a distinction which is fairly obvious and, if technical language be avoided, intelligible even to people who have not much education; and, at any rate, that it is highly advantageous to those who can understand it, inasmuch as it tells them what to aim at, what to work for. At the same time, in popular instructions there is no need to draw any formal distinctions between those two mutually dependent acts of the one individual soul. The preacher who succeeds in convincing people, or in getting them to convince themselves, of the malice of sin, from the motive of perfect contrition, may rest assured that the further step will be taken naturally, unconsciously and certainly, and that true hatred and detestation of sin will result—and indeed the procedure I recommended above<sup>1</sup> for the actual practical eliciting of an act of perfect contrition keeps this distinction entirely in the background.

I should perhaps add that I can commend my method on much higher authority than my own. It is simple, direct, practical, suited to any intelligence and (I know from experience) very effective in moving sinners to repentance. It all comes to this, then, that by attending to just two things—prayer and the consideration of the motive—one may elicit this most salutary and meritorious act of perfect contrition.

<sup>1</sup> Section ii. p. 206 *supra*.

Finally, I will support my contention that perfect contrition is easy by one extraneous argument. God sincerely 'wishes all men (even sinners) to be saved.' Wishing the end He must wish the means to that end. But the only means of salvation in many cases will be the eliciting of an act of perfect contrition, and if the means were as difficult as some people imagine it is very hard to understand how God sincerely wishes a result depending on it. And so we have another reason for saying that perfect contrition is not very difficult, even for a person in the state of sin; and, naturally, it is easier still for a person in the state of grace.

(2) It is not enough, however, to teach people the theoretic method of eliciting an act of perfect contrition, and to convince them that, without very great effort, they can actually elicit such contrition; the important duty remains of impressing on them the necessity of frequently practising the method they have been taught. In this, as in other departments, it is practice only which will give facility in performing the act, and give reasonable assurance that in emergencies one will be equal to the occasion. Most of us have heard the proverb (rather imperfectly worded) that 'no one ever learned to swim on the bank.' One may know the theory perfectly—the correct position of the body, the proper action of the limbs, the 'keeping cool' and the rest—still it is practically certain that one will not swim successfully on a first attempt, and that it will require many attempts and much practice to make a good swimmer. Similarly, mere theoretical knowledge of the method of eliciting perfect contrition, and the persuasion that one is able to elicit it, gives no guarantee that one will succeed on a first attempt—an attempt which must be made, perhaps, under unforeseen difficulties. Considering how much may depend on the performance of this act one should run no risks; and, therefore, one should frequently practise the method and so acquire facility. It is advisable, then, to exhort people, who are preparing for confession, to strive after perfect contrition. It is not of course necessary along with the sacrament; still we should try and have it because it is a higher and better form of sorrow; and, especially, because we have then an excellent opportunity of practising the method of eliciting it. Another opportunity of practice is found in the admirable habit of some good people, who, before retiring to rest, every night, elicit an act of perfect contrition—a devotion which cannot be



too strongly recommended because of the intrinsic value of the meritorious act, because it is a great safeguard as 'we should be always ready,' and because this frequent practice is sure to give facility.

(3) Finally, every missionary priest meets good people, occasionally, who have very strong vivid faith, who realize the eternal years to come, who try to make all their days 'full days,' in the Scriptural sense, and who seek advice and direction as to a solid and profitable private devotion. You cannot recommend them anything better than the frequent eliciting of acts of perfect contrition; no act of private devotion can compare with it. Bring them to the Tabernacle or the Crucifix—perfect contrition will be the 'open sesame.' It will be the fulfilment, equivalently if not formally, of the first and the greatest commandment of the Law, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.' This penitential spirit for the past will provide the best remedy against relapse in the future. The habit itself, and the realization of the truths incidental to its practice, will provide an excellent safeguard in emergencies and give the best assurance of perseverance unto the end.

O priests of God, who are working for the salvation of souls redeemed by the Precious Blood of Christ, and on whose efforts the salvation of so many depend, be convinced that perfect contrition is the best means to secure your end. Study this doctrine carefully. Preach it incessantly. Persuade your people that it is not very difficult. Induce them to practise it frequently. Point out to them its extraordinary advantages. Teach them some method, and go over it with them, step by step, carefully and regularly. You cannot do them—or God—a better service.

'A MISSIONARY PRIEST.'

# ‘THE WOMAN OF THE PIERCING WAIL’ (THE LADY NUALA O’DONNELL)

By H. CONCANNON

O Woman of the Piercing Wail  
Who mournest o’er yon mound of clay  
    With sigh and groan,  
Would God thou wert among the Gael!  
Thou wouldst not then from day to day  
    Weep thus alone.

Two princes of the line of Conn  
Sleep in their cells of clay beside  
    O’Donnell Roe;  
Three royal youths, alas! are gone,  
Who lived for Erin’s weal, but died  
    For Erin’s woe!

The youths whose relics moulder here  
Were sprung from Hugh, high prince and lord  
    Of Aileach’s lands;  
Thy noble brothers, justly dear,  
Thy nephew, long to be deplored  
    By Ulster’s bands.

And who can marvel o’er thy grief,  
Or who can blame thy flowing tears,  
    That knows their source?  
O’Donnell, Dunnasava’s chief,  
Cut off amid his vernal years,  
    Lies here a corse  
Beside his brother Cathbar, whom  
Tyrconnell of the Helmets mourns  
    In deep despair—  
For valour, truth, and comely bloom,  
For all that greatens and adorns  
    A peerless pair.

. . . And he, the third,  
The Lord of Mourne, O’Niall’s son,  
    Their mate in death—  
A prince in look, in deed, and word.

## I

Is it a woman of flesh and blood whom the white light of the  
great poem reveals to us, a tragic and desolate figure,



bending over the graves of her brothers and of her sister’s son in the shadowed Church of Montorio? Or is it Ireland, lonely among the nations, unconsolated, lifting up her voice in woe for the passing of her princely children; for the hopes that were buried with Red Hugh at Valladolid, with his brothers Ruairi and Cathbar on the Janiculum; for the brightness and the glory that were quenched for ever in the exile and the blindness of Hugh O’Neill? Is that darked-robed lady, who lifts a pale and tragic face and eyes half-blind with weeping to the glory of the Transfiguration<sup>1</sup> above the high altar, Nuala, the ‘daughter of O’Donnell,’ or is it she—‘Kathaleen, the daughter of Houlihan,’—for whose dear sake the greatest of the O’Donnells died, whose ‘holy, delicate, white hands had girdled Red Hugh with steel.’ Scarcely the bard himself can distinguish, as he waits for his lady, tuning his harp to a new note of resignation, to meet her mood when she shall arise from her mourner’s place, and dry her ‘overflowing eyes.’ Here before him, under the outward form of Nuala,

Erin, once the Great and Free  
Now vainly mourns her breakless chain  
And iron thrall.

The ‘faithful crucifix’ he holds forth to the ‘daughter of O’Donnell’ has been clasped close to Ireland’s heart for all the centuries since. The ‘path’ he points out to the Lady Nuala, ‘the path of pain and prayer her Saviour trod,’<sup>2</sup> has been worn bare by the feet of Ireland. When the Bard of the O’Donnells thus mingles the two identities is there need for us to separate them? When we tell the life-story of the Lady Nuala O’Donnell, do we not tell, in part at least, the story of Ireland too?

The tale begins brightly enough. A little girl, whose first view of the world was got from the battlements of Donegal Castle, must have found that world a fair and goodly place. The same poet<sup>3</sup> who was to sing of Nuala’s sorrow has told us some of the glories of her princely home:

<sup>1</sup> Raphael’s famous picture of the Transfiguration, now in the Vatican, was painted as an altar-piece for the Church of San Pietro in Montorio, and remained there until 1797, when it was stolen by the French (v. Archbishop Healy’s *Irish Graves in Rome*, p. 5).

<sup>2</sup> Mac-an-Ward’s ‘Lament,’ Stanza 17.

<sup>3</sup> Mac-an-Ward’s poem on ‘The Ruins of Donegal Castle’ has been also translated by Clarence Mangan.

the 'mansion of chaste melody,' 'the palace of the wine,'  
'the many-gated court,' 'the bright walled, beaming one':—

How often from thy turrets high,  
Thy purple turrets, have we seen  
Long lines of glittering ships, when summer-time draws nigh,  
With mast and sails of snow-white sheen!

How often seen, when gazing round,  
From thy tall towers, the hunting trains,  
The blood enlivening chase, the horseman and the hound,  
Thou fastness of a hundred plains.

How often to thy banquets bright  
We have seen the strong-armed Gaels repair,  
And when the feast was over, once again unite  
For battle, in thy bass-court fair!

Of all the 'thousand treasures' of that 'bright-walled, beaming one' none were more precious than the lovely children, four boys and two girls, whom Ineen Dubh, 'the Dark Daughter of the Isles,' bore proudly to her lord, the valiant Sir Hugh O'Donnell. 'A famous progeny sprung from O'Donnell (Hugh, son of Manus, son of Hugh Oge, son of Hugh Roe, son of Niall Garbh, son of Turlough of the Wine). Ineen Dubh, daughter of James, son of Alexander, son of John Cathenach MacDonnell . . . was the wife of O'Donnell, and she was the mother of the most renowned of his children.' So Lughaid O'Clery begins his stirring tale of Red Hugh's life,<sup>1</sup> and in that warlike chronicle, he thinks fit only to give 'the names of their sons in the order of their birth: Hugh Roe, Ruairi, Manus and Cathbar.'<sup>2</sup> The two girls Siobhan<sup>3</sup> and Nuala only serve,

<sup>1</sup> Edited with historical introduction, translation, notes, etc., by Rev. Denis Murphy, S.J. (Dublin, 1895). The references in the following article will be to Father Murphy's edition.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Siobhan was probably the eldest of the family, and must have been born not later than 1569. The inscription on the tomb in San Pietro in Montorio shows that her eldest child, Hugh, was born in 1585. The date of Red Hugh's birth (circa 1572) is fixed approximately by two dates in O'Clery's narrative: he states (p. 9) that the young Prince was not fifteen when he was abducted by Perrott's treacherous ruse in 1587, and at his death in 1602 he had not completed his 30th year (*ib.* p. 327). Ruairi's birth-year, according to the San Pietro inscription, would be 1575, and Cathbar's 1583. There remain to be determined the birth-years of Manus and Nuala. O'Clery tells us (*op. cit.* p. 57) that Nuala was already married to Niall Garbh in 1592. This will place her birth-year with some degree of probability about 1577—not later. Manus may have been born about 1579 or 1580. He was old enough to play a man's part in the battle in which he met his death at the hands of Niall Garbh (A.D. 1600) (O'Clery, p. 257).



in his eyes apparently, ‘to knit two clans together’ and he merely mentions them<sup>1</sup> and to show the alliances contracted through them.

Siobhan, the eldest, was early betrothed to Hugh O’Neill, Earl of Tyrone; and little Nuala, our heroine, had, perhaps, barely emerged from childhood when she was promised to her cousin Niall Garbh, and the feud that had raged between these two branches of the O’Donnells since Sir Hugh had succeeded his brother Calvach as the O’Donnell (instead of Calvach’s son Conn, father of Niall Garbh) was thus, it was fondly believed, permanently healed.

But if the girls only had importance in the eyes of one who, like the chronicler, was mainly concerned with the greatness of the family, for the alliances they made possible, that was no reason why their education should be neglected. Perhaps it was an additional reason why it should not.

Their lady-mother, Ineen Dubh, ‘the head of advice and council of the Cinel Conaill, slow and very deliberate and much praised for her womanly qualities, yet with a heart of a hero and the soul of a soldier,’<sup>2</sup> had experience enough in her own person of all that was demanded of a chieftain’s wife, to feel deeply the necessity of preparing her daughters for their vocation. We know little of Siobhan, who can hardly have been more than one-and-twenty, when she died in 1590, leaving two little sons behind her, Hugh and Henry.<sup>3</sup> Her husband speedily consoled himself, for his romantic marriage with Mabel Bagenal took place but a few months later. There are some who may draw from this circumstance the inference that Siobhan left behind her but a pale memory of a somewhat colourless personality; though perhaps they might not be justified in this inference, for Mr. Standish O’Grady reminds us of the admirable way Countess Siobhan governed her husband’s territory during his absence in England, the year before her death.<sup>4</sup> But of Nuala’s character we are left in no doubt. It needs not for the

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. pp. 5 and 57.

<sup>2</sup> O’Clery, p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> Hugh, better known as the Baron of Dungannon, died in Rome in 1609, aged 24, and was buried in the Church of San Pietro in Montorio. Henry entered the service of Spain in Flanders, and, as Colonel Henry, figures largely in the State Papers of the period.

<sup>4</sup> *The Flight of the Eagle*, p. 174.

poet to have caught the 'piercing wail,' and sent it ringing for ever adown the years from

The mount, whereon the martyr-saint  
Was crucified,

to tell us that in Nuala lived on the passionate heart of Ineen Dubh. To her second girl, truly, the 'Dark Daughter of the Isles' had passed on her own dauntless resolution, her fearlessness, her resourcefulness, her fierce and vehement devotion to the family, and specially to its glorious young chieftain, Red Hugh. That is revealed to us by the facts of Nuala's life. When we read the story of Nuala, we know that in the years when Ineen Dubh was working for the greatness of her eldest boy 'the prophesied son of mighty deeds,'<sup>1</sup> she was forming, too, the heart and mind of the little girl who was to carry into exile the heart of a hero and the soul of a soldier, strongest guard of the glory of her race.

The education thought suitable for an Irish lady of high birth was wide and liberal, and we may feel certain that Ineen Dubh saw to it that her daughters got such training as would fit them to hold their own with any woman of their rank. Her own mother, the Lady Agnes Campbell (now married to O'Neill, Turlough Luineach), had been praised by Sir Henry Sidney, as 'a grave, wise, well-spoken lady in Scottish, English, and French,' and probably among the womanly accomplishments for which O'Clery praised Ineen Dubh might be reckoned a knowledge of several languages—Gaelic (in its two branches) and English and French at least—and conversational gifts of no mean order. These she would be at pains to pass on to her daughters, as she sat with them over the embroidery for which Irish ladies have always been famous, or initiated them in garden or still-room, into the healing powers of herbs and the manufacture of salves and potions. Ever since the days when Cuchulain went a-wooing of Emer these have been the 'six gifts of womanhood' in Irish eyes—the gift of beauty, the gift of voice, the gift of sweet speech, the gift of needlework, the gift of wisdom, the gift of chastity.<sup>2</sup> From the Franciscan Convent near at hand one of the brethren would come, doubtless, to teach the little ladies to read Latin; for medieval Catholics took part in Church

<sup>1</sup> O'Clery, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Lady Gregory's *Cuchulain of Muirthemne*, p. 22.



services in a manner which should bring shame on our unintelligent detachment, and no one, with any pretensions to education, would fail to follow Mass or ‘Hour’ in their own stately Latin. Perhaps the same brother taught them penmanship, and to fire their emulation, would carry up to them now and then, from the book-room in the convent, some beautiful manuscript, in which the most skilful scribe of the community had copied the Chronicle of their own illustrious race. Gracious forms of high-born noble ladies, detached themselves from that chronicle to take possession of the heart and imagination of their little descendant : that other Nuala, who more than a century ago, had founded the convent, and who now lay, awaiting the Resurrection, beneath its high-altar<sup>1</sup> ; Fingalla, her successor, equally munificent to the brethren, whose widowhood had been spent in a little cell near the monastery, preparing herself, with fasting, and alms deeds, and prayer for the solemn day when she, too, should be carried under the roof of the brethrens’ church, to claim its ultimate hospitality. Many others there were, distinguished by the Annalists’ praise ‘for knowledge, hospitality, good sense, and piety,’ one remembered as ‘humane and charitable,’ yet another ‘as a nurse to all guests and strangers, and to all the learned men of Ireland.’ Very high was the ideal of womanhood thus presented to Irish maidens ; and little Nuala, as she copied her script, or bent over her embroidery, was busily copying, for the development of her own nature and character, from models as well defined, if not as tangible, as those impressed on the vellum or leather that lay before her.

It is probable that the boys of the family were early sent away from home to be ‘fostered’ by neighbouring chiefs. We learn from O’Clery<sup>2</sup> that Red Hugh ‘immediately after his birth was given to be fostered to the high-born nobles of the tribe of Conall Gulban, son of Niall, and it was not these alone that got him to rear and foster, but some of the tribe of Eoghan, son of Niall, took him.’ But there would be occasions—great family gatherings—when the boys would return with their fosterers to the ancestral castle, and the grim keep would be all joyous with their boyish laughter and games. Perhaps little Nuala, learning to

<sup>1</sup> Meehan, *Rise and Fall of Franciscan Monasteries in Ireland*, pp. 4-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 3.

manage her first pony, would go a-riding some bright morning with her brothers—a graceful and charming little figure (with the dark eyes and dark hair of her mother, one imagines), in her white robe and red embroidered mantle. Or old Brother Infirmarian in the convent below, looking out of the windows of the infirmary on to the blue waters of the bay, would see the same vivid little figure seated proudly by the tiller of a boat, while the tall brothers, Aodh and Ruari, skilfully managed the sails. Oh! blue Bay of Donegal, that goes for ever lonely, wanting the bright youth, the beloved one, whom so often it did bear upon its bosom. Oh! Hills of Donegal, that seem for ever listening for the silver tones of the voice of Hugh.<sup>1</sup>

Such a family gathering, calling back the boys from the castles of their fosterers, and the clansmen from the distant hills, would be occasioned by the marriage of Siobhan to Hugh O'Neill, Baron of Dungannon, about 1584. Very splendid, we may be sure, was the hospitality shown by Ineen Dubh and her lord on this occasion, and great were the treasures of silver and gold set forth on the banqueting tables in the great hall of feasting; rich and lavish were the viands and salmon from the bay, and venison from the hills, fat capons, and mighty barons of beef, generous the Spanish wines. There were gifts that day in great store for 'the bardic companies of pleasant-meadowed Fóla.' In the church of the monastery, wherein the Baron and Lady Siobhan exchanged their marriage vows before a gorgeous company of knights and ladies, all the treasures, of which poor Father Donat Mooney bears such a wistful memory<sup>2</sup> (long after the convent was destroyed), were taken from their strong place in the sacristy to do the great occasion honour.

After Siobhan's marriage and departure for her new home in Dungannon, we can imagine a few years of quiet study for the little sister left behind in Donegal. Perhaps when, in the following year, an heir was born to the Earl and Countess of Tyrone, the baby's young aunt was

<sup>1</sup> Father Donat O'Mooney, who, before joining the Franciscans, had served as a soldier in the armies of the two Hughs, gives a description of Hugh Roe: 'he was of middle height, ruddy, of comely face, and beautiful to behold. His voice was like the music of a silver trumpet. His morals were unimpeachable.' (Quoted by Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, p. 149. n.)

<sup>2</sup> Meehan, *Franciscan Monasteries*, p. 11.



brought to see him, and to hold him in her arms. If Earl Hugh, visiting his young Countess in her bower, smiled at the tender pretty scene made by little Nuala with the baby in her arms, was any sad premonitory angel there to whisper of a day—and of a distant hill in Rome—and Nuala, bending in desolate woe over the grave of that same boy,—‘her nephew long to be deplored’—and all the hopes that were buried with him?

All bright to Nuala’s memory in the after years were those days of childhood, which were to come, alas! to such a speedy close. If ‘black care’ hovered over the castle, little Nuala knew naught of it. But her mother had her own cause for anxiety, though her resolute heart would scarce let her admit as much. Her lord was growing old and feeble, and her passionate desire was to secure to her eldest son, Red Hugh, the succession to the chieftainship. There were rival claimants. Her husband had been married before, and Donnell, the son of the first wife, considered his own claim best.<sup>1</sup> He would stop at nothing, not even an alliance with the English, to make good his pretension. Not only that, but the present chieftain had been, himself, a younger brother, and two direct descendants of his brother Calvach (Hugh, called ‘son of the Dean,’ and Niall Garbh) lived on to assert their claims should occasion favour them. For the moment, Ineen Dubh’s diplomacy seemed to have succeeded with Niall Garbh. She had bound him to her cause, as she thought, with the strongest bonds. Her son was fostered by Niall Garbh’s father; her daughter was betrothed to Niall Garbh himself.<sup>2</sup> As for Donnell, while her own son went on his triumphant progress from one chief’s fostering to the other, winning all hearts by his radiant and comely youth, and the promise of great deeds that was written in the flashing grey eyes<sup>3</sup> and the high-bred, ardent young face of him, Donnell’s cause had few enough adherents. Was not this splendid, bright-haired boy (whom to look at, as the Four Masters tell us, was

<sup>1</sup> It must be remembered that in Irish Law, primogeniture conferred no right of succession. The English recognized it in dealing with Irish clans when it suited themselves—not otherwise.

<sup>2</sup> O’Clery, p. 57. ‘Fostering,’ says Sir John Davis (‘Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued by the English,’ p. 179; London, 1612), ‘hath always been in the opinion of the Irish people a stronger alliance than blood, and the foster-children do love, and are beloved by, their foster-parents and their sept more than their natural parents.’

<sup>3</sup> O’Clery speaks of the quick glance of his keen eye’ (op. cit. p. 231).

to love) the 'god-like prince,' of whom St. Caillin had prophesied ?

There will come a man glorious, pure, exalted,  
Who will cause mournful weeping in every territory ;  
He will be the god-like prince  
And he will be king for nine years.<sup>1</sup>

It was not among his kinsmen alone that the fame of the boy spread, and the conviction 'that something would ensue through him,' if he reached manhood. To 'the foreigners of Dublin,' as O'Clery tells us,<sup>2</sup> 'the fame and renown of the youth were reported, and they reflected in their minds that there would not be one like him of the Irish to avenge his wrongs and punish the plundering of his race, if he was allowed to reach manhood.' We all know what a dastardly expedient was employed by the English Lord Deputy, Sir John Perrott, to get the boy into his power. A hundred times the tale has been told<sup>3</sup> of 'the ship with wines,' the 'vessel with black gunwale deceptive,' that, on a harvest day of the year 1587, sailed into Lough Swilly, and dropped anchor off Rathmullen, and of how, having lured young Hugh Roe and his companions on board to a wine-feast, she sailed forth again 'with the current of the tide,' bearing the boy to his doleful captivity in Dublin Castle. It was a black day for Tyrconnell when that ship sailed into Lough Swilly ; but perhaps it was a day yet blacker for England. For all unknown to herself she was giving to this boy the opportunity to complete his education, to chose his life-task, and to prepare himself for it. As he talked with the other prisoners in the Castle, he began to realize that it was not to him or to Tyrconnell alone that England had been a treacherous and cruel foe. 'It was their solace and satisfaction, day and night,' says O'Clery,<sup>4</sup> 'in the close prison where they were, to be lamenting over the hardships and sufferings, and relating the great cruelty which was inflicted on them, and hearing of the unjust sentences pronounced and the wrongs and wicked deeds done against the high-born descendants of the sons of Milesius and of the Fingallians alike.' If the lad had been left among his

<sup>1</sup> O'Clery, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. pp. 3-5.

<sup>3</sup> The most dramatic version is perhaps that of Mr. Standish O'Grady in *The Flight of the Eagle*, which for all its picturesque vividness follows closely enough the narrative of O'Clery (op. cit. pp. 7-11).

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 13.



native hills, learning his knightly feats from his fosterers, preparing himself for the rôle his mother had cast for him, who can doubt but that, his outlook necessarily provincial, he would have been content to figure as a 'local chieftain,' 'a preyer and plunderer' of one neighbour's territory, an ally of another's, satisfied to be the O'Donnell, the chieftain of a strong territory. But as he lay in chains in Dublin Castle there came into his prison-cell the exquisite vision of 'Dark Rosaleen'—Ireland herself, his Queen and Mistress, and the boy vowed his life to her service:—

Woe and pain, pain and woe,  
Are my lot, night and noon,  
To see your bright face clouded so  
Like to the mournful moon.  
But yet . . . will I rear your throne  
Again in golden sheen;  
'Tis you shall reign, shall reign alone,  
My Dark Rosaleen!  
My own Rosaleen!  
'Tis you shall have the golden throne,  
'Tis you shall reign, and reign alone,  
My Dark Rosaleen!

Over dews, over sands  
Will I fly for your weal;  
Your holy delicate white hands  
Shall girdle me with steel.  
At home in your emerald bowers,  
From morning dawn till e'en,  
You'll pray for me, my flower of flowers,  
My dark Rosaleen.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Standish O'Grady has pictured for us, in moving wise,<sup>2</sup> the grief of the dark-haired lady, Hugh Roe's mother, when the messenger of Mac Swiney na dTuath raced into the courtyard of Donegal Castle with the tragic, and humiliating, tidings of her son's capture. But let us rather seek out little Nuala, in some dim corner of her father's castle, weeping out her lonely child's heart for the fate of her idolized brother. Little consolation have we to offer her, for something more than Hugh has been borne away in that 'vessel with black gunwale deceptive.' The bright and careless happiness of childhood has been borne away in it,

<sup>1</sup> Mangan says that 'Roisin Dubh' (the title of this poem in the original Irish) 'was written by a poet of Red Hugh, and is supposed to be addressed to Ireland by that famous chieftain (note in Mr. O'Donoghue's edition of Mangan's poems, p. 3).

<sup>2</sup> *The Flight of the Eagle*, p. 50.

not to return even on that night of joy when the young Prince was to come back among his own again—or even during the nine years of his victories, when the banner of O'Donnell was to be carried in triumph from one end of Ireland to another. So we leave little Nuala to her weeping, while we steal softly away.

## II

Ineen Dubh, the 'Dark Daughter' of the dauntless Isles was not the woman to spend in useless weeping the time that might be employed in thwarting the designs of her son's enemies. She offered an enormous ransom, and was ready to give any other of her sons in pledge so that her eldest boy should be set free. She tried to work on the well-known cupidity of the new Lord Deputy, Perrott's successor, Fitzwilliam. She got her son-in-law, Earl Hugh, to write from Dungannon<sup>1</sup> to his friends at the Court of Queen Elizabeth: the Earl of Leicester and Walsingham, but it was all in vain. The Queen herself interfered to prevent the boy's release, and her high-pitched, hectoring, vehement tones are heard in the letter<sup>2</sup> Fitzwilliam presently received from the Lords of the Council, drawing his attention to the fact that the 'Scotch woman was unlikely to stir so long as Hugh Roe remaineth in the Castle of Dublin, who, with O'Gallagher's son, be also good pledges for the Earl of Tyrone.' The truth is that Hugh O'Neill's 'loyalty' was more than a little suspect ever since he had allied himself with the O'Donnells by his marriage with Lady Siobhan, and his letter to Walsingham may have done more harm than good.

In the meantime Ineen Dubh had her hands pretty full at home. Her husband was old and feeble, and now that her eldest son was safely out of the way, the rival claimants to the chieftaincy were determined to make the most of their opportunity. Hugh, 'son of the Dean,' an illegitimate son of Calvach O'Donnell, was perhaps the most formidable amongst them for the moment. Hugh O'Neill's letter to Walsingham shows that Hugh, son of the Dean, had English support at his back,<sup>3</sup> and he was clever

<sup>1</sup> *Carew MSS.*, vol. 619, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Father Murphy in his *Introduction to O'Clery*, p. xxxvi.

<sup>3</sup> 'The rather for that Hugh, son of the Dean, who was at court at my last being there hath almost driven O'Donnell out of his country (Letter of Hugh O'Neill to Walsingham, *loc. cit.*).



enough to make for himself a party out of some of the discontented clansmen, the MacSwineys of Lough Foyle, the O'Dohertys, the O'Gallaghers.<sup>1</sup> Old Turlough Luineach O'Neill, though married to Ineen Dubh's mother, the Lady Agnes Campbell, had apparently no love for his step-daughter, and gladly sent his men-at-arms from Strabane to aid her enemies.<sup>2</sup> A couple of scoundrelly English captains, Willis and Conell, were let loose with a band of savage soldiery in Tyrconnell.<sup>3</sup> They besieged Donegal Castle, and though O'Clery says they 'could do no harm to Sir Hugh O'Donnell, who was in it,' a letter to Walsingham from his spy, Mr. Patrick Fox<sup>4</sup> (dated Feb. 12, 1589), would seem to indicate that Ineen Dubh, afraid of the castle serving her enemies as a garrison, burned it herself,<sup>5</sup> and fled with her children to her kinsfolk in Scotland. The poor friars in the convent were driven away, and the brutal soldiery took up their unhallowed residence in the holy place, whence they ravaged and pillaged the country in the most ruthless way. With their young prince in irons in Dublin Castle, and their valiant-hearted lady away in Scotland, the hillsmen of Donegal were sorely terrified by these soldiers of London.

on account of the strangeness of their weapons and appearance and the novelty of their armour and speech and the loud noise of their trumpets, and tabours and war-music, together with the cruelty and activity of their warriors.<sup>6</sup> They used to go through the country commonly in companies and in bands in twos and threes to carry off food and provisions for themselves, and they did not hesitate to take with them their [the country people's] heavy cattle and long fleeced sheep at all times. They called additional troops to go beyond Bearnas More in order to oppress and plunder the territory and everywhere rob them of their herds and flocks and reduce them to slavery and great misery in the end.<sup>7</sup>

But presently Ineen Dubh returned from her native Isles with a number of Scottish troops,<sup>8</sup> and by their aid

<sup>1</sup> The reasons for their disaffection is given by O'Clery, op. cit., p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> O'Clery, pp. 43-45.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp. 33-37.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Father Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, p. 414 n.

<sup>5</sup> It was only partially destroyed, for we find it subsequently sheltering the English troops supporting Niall Garbh (O'Clery, p. 291). According to Mac-an-Ward's poem its final destruction was at the hands of Red Hugh himself.

<sup>6</sup> O'Clery, p. 35.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 37.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 41.

routed some of her son's enemies. Hugh, son of the Dean, was slain by them.<sup>1</sup>

They were recognized among the Irish soldiers [says O'Clery]<sup>2</sup> by the difference of their arms and clothing, their habits and language, for their exterior dress was motilled cloaks to the calf of the leg with ties and fastenings. Their girdles were over their loins and outside the cloaks. Many of them had swords with hafts of horn, large, fit for war, from their shoulders. It was necessary for the soldier to put his two hands together at the very haft of his sword when he would strike a blow with it.

Where was little Nuala all this time, when her country was being laid waste, the stately home of her race destroyed, her mother fighting like a lioness for her son's right against her son's enemies? No one has told us, but it seems very likely that when Ineen Dubh returned from Scotland to Ireland, she left her little daughter with her kinsfolk in the former country, and she may have remained there until her mother's diplomacy was crowned by Nuala's marriage with Niall Garbh.

In 1588, while these things were happening in Tyrconnell, and while Red Hugh was in captivity in Dublin Castle, the Armada sailed on its disastrous expedition. A great deal of obscurity rests on the question of the treatment the poor ship-wrecked survivors of that once proud fleet met with at the hands of the Irish chieftains. But to an impartial mind, the stories accepted by O'Grady<sup>3</sup> and others are contradicted by the indisputable fact that exactly five years later<sup>4</sup> the Irish chieftains, in the person of Red Hugh, applied to King Philip, with the greatest confidence, for help against the English. Will anyone, for one moment, believe that, if his unfortunate subjects had been treated by the Irish chieftains in the way alleged by these historians, Philip II was the man to forgive and forget, thus easily and quickly, a crime so atrocious, that even at this distance of time the mere allegation of it makes us, later-born Irish, almost sick with shame. One thing is certain, Hugh O'Neill, in his Castle of Dungannon, hid the Spaniards whom Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam was chasing, and saw to it that they were conveyed in safety to Scotland.<sup>5</sup> MacSwiney na dTuath<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Annals of the Four Masters*, v. 1855, 1873.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc cit.* p. 73.

<sup>3</sup> *The Flight of the Eagle*, pp. 62 and 283.

<sup>4</sup> A.D. 1593. O'Clery, *op. cit.* p. 61.

<sup>5</sup> O'Sullivan's *Catholic History* (Byrne's Translation) p. 65.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 61.



was equally true to the instincts of Irish honour and Irish hospitality; and O'Rourke of Breffny was ready to sacrifice everything, lands and freedom and life itself, rather than give up to Fitzwilliam the Spaniards who had sought shelter with him.<sup>1</sup>

If little Nuala was in Scotland in these years she may have known many of these poor Spaniards, and her education in the sorrow of life—the woe, for which as well as for death ‘Adam’s race is born,’—was fast advanced.

The year 1590 was memorable in Nuala’s life for two great woes. The first was the death of Siobhan, and the second was the unsuccessful attempt at escape of her brother, Hugh, from his dungeon in Dublin Castle. Ineen Dubh, back in Tyreconnell, having slain, with the aid of her Scottish troops, the two chief rivals of her son, Hugh ‘son of the Dean,’ and Donnell, her own step-son,<sup>2</sup> found herself free to plan for the liberation of her son. But, alas! the attempt was destined to end in failure, and the boy was taken from the very arms of liberty and put back into his cruel fetters. All Ireland grieved at the sorrowful tale.

There came [says the chronicler<sup>3</sup>] a great gloom over the Irish, and the courage of their soldiers, and the minds of their champions, and the hearts of their heroes were confounded at hearing that news. There were many princesses, and great ladies, and noble white-breasted maidens sorrowing and lamenting on this account. There were many high-born nobles clapping their hands and weeping in secret for him, and he not only parted from the people with whom he was on terms of friendship and intimacy, but he went among those who had done him evil and shown him enmity.

Perhaps about 1591 Nuala’s marriage with Niall Garbh took place. Poor little bride! There can have been little in the aspect of her ‘rough’ bridegroom to hold out much hope of happiness in the new life then entered upon. Friend and foe, English and Irish, are singularly agreed in their estimate of Niall Garbh. Sir Henry Dowcra writes of him as ‘proud, valiant, miserable, tyrannous, unnecessarily covetous, without any knowledge of God, or almost any civility.’<sup>4</sup> O’Clery describes him as ‘a violent man,

<sup>1</sup> O’Sullivan’s *Catholic History*, pp. 61-63.

<sup>2</sup> Donnell was slain by one of the ‘Scottish arrows’ so graphically described by O’Clery, at Teelin, in 1590. His son, Domhnall Og, was one of those who fled with ‘the Earls’ in 1607.

<sup>3</sup> O’Clery, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Cox, *Hib. Angl.* i. 426. ‘This man might well be called Garuff, i.e. rough, or rude,’ says Cox himself.

hasty, austere, vindictive, with the venom of a serpent; with the impetuosity of a lion. He was a hero in valour, and brave. He was the head of an army and of troops in battle and war.' <sup>1</sup>

Christmas Eve, of the year 1591, 'when it seemed to the Son of the Virgin full time that he should escape,' Red Hugh broke prison, and after many dramatic adventures, which have been told repeatedly, <sup>2</sup> arrived back in his father's Castle of Ballyshannon.

Hither Clann Conaill flocked to him, and when he had rested a little he set out on his first exploit, to drive the English from the Monastery of Donegal. The mere hint of his presence was enough for these brave men, who had played such a valiant rôle against the unarmed shepherds of the Donegal mountain-sides. They ran for their lives as soon as they heard he was near, leaving behind them all the booty they had taken. The brethren returned immediately :—

And set about cleansing and renovating the monastery after the barbarous crew, and saying the divine Office and the Mass as was their custom, and praising the Lord in their prayers and in their petitions sometimes on behalf of their friends and of their benefactors, and especially of Hugh O'Donnell, for it was he that brought them back to their abode of psalmody, to their pleasant hospitable dwelling, and drove away the savage foreigners. <sup>3</sup>

On the day when the brethren sang the *Te Deum* in their restored church, we can imagine the Lady Nuala present with her mother, and whatever might be her sorrows at the time, here at least was one day of pure and exalted happiness.

Radiant joy too was hers, loyal sister that she was, on that day in May, of the year 1592, when her brother stood on the Rock of Doon, near Kilmacrenan, and the O'Friel inaugurated him Chieftain. Lonely amid the moors it stands now, and only the pilgrim who comes to drink the healing waters of St. Columb's holy well raises his eyes to that historic summit. But surely we have imagination enough to see it, as it looked on that summer's day, long, long ago, when 'the prophesied son of mighty deeds' stood upon it, high above the splendid company gathered

<sup>1</sup> O'Clery, p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> The authorities are O'Clery, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-33, and O'Sullivan's *Catholic History*, pp. 66-68 (O'Byrne's Trans.).

<sup>3</sup> O'Clery, p. 37.



around it, and stretched the white wand of his authority—straight and stainless—over the far spread fields of his territory, thrice from left to right, and thrice from right to left, in honour of the Holy Trinity. And among the silence can we not hear the erenach shout out, to the listening hills, the great name of O'Donnell? <sup>1</sup>

For eight years we hear nothing of Lady Nuala. But during these eight years it was not the hills of Tyrconnell alone that re-echoed to the name of O'Donnell, for these were the years of Red Hugh's victories. Proud as Nuala must have been of her brother, one fancies that her life during these eight years cannot have been very happy, and if the little boy Neachtan was her son,<sup>2</sup> even his coming cannot have brought her much joy. For Nuala knew, none better, how precarious was her husband's loyalty, and what untiring efforts the English enemies of her brother made to play on Niall's jealousy and sense of wrongs. She can hardly have been surprised when the inevitable end came in 1600, and while her brother was in Sligo, on his way to Thomond, Niall, whom he had left behind him in command of Tyrconnell, deserted to the English.<sup>3</sup>

Woe to the mind that conceived, woe to the heart that entertained, woe to the tongue that advised that violent, ruinous, odious, malicious plan that was entered into then! Woe to the kinsman who abandoned his own tribe, and his earthly lord, his friends and relatives, to go plotting and uniting with his enemies and foes! Alas! that they did not strive and carry on the contest together, for it was not simple or easy to pierce or penetrate their surrounding or to circumvent them as long as they were in peace and unity with each other.<sup>4</sup>

One tragedy followed the other in quick succession. Nuala, fleeing in horror from her traitor husband,<sup>5</sup> had soon to grieve for her young brother, Manus, slain at his hands.<sup>6</sup> She was, we may believe, with her mother in Donegal Castle, when the sad procession came ‘over Bearnus westward,’ bearing on a litter of woven, fair wattles the body of Manus, wounded to death by Niall's spear. How

<sup>1</sup> The ceremonies used in inaugurating Irish chieftains are described by Joyce, *Social History of Ireland*, vol. i. pp. 44 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Neachtan was arrested with his father Niall Garbh in 1608, and first sent to Oxford, but afterwards put in the Tower of London. I do not know whether he was Nuala's son, or whether Niall Garbh had been married before.

<sup>3</sup> O'Clery p. 249; O'Sullivan, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup> O'Clery, p. 251.

<sup>5</sup> O'Sullivan, p. 136.

<sup>6</sup> O'Clery, p. 257.

well they knew how to die, these O'Donnells! Nor was Manus, boy that he was, the least learned in that supreme science. For a week he lay on 'his sick-man's couch,' the physicians of the body, knowing their powerlessness, leaving him in peace to the physicians of the soul:—

Some of the most experienced of these people (i.e. the Franciscans) used to come to him to strengthen his friendship with the Lord. They proceeded to instruct and advise him. He made a contrite confession, without any concealment, and he declared his transgressions then. He wept for his sins before God, and he was sorry for his pride and arrogance in former times. He forgave also the person who wounded him, and he said he himself was the cause of his death, for he first attacked Niall.<sup>1</sup>

So he lay for a week, in great pain of body, but exquisite peace of soul, and dying on the 22nd October, 1600, was laid to rest in the tomb of his ancestors in the Monastery of Donegal—the only one of Ineen Dubh's children to rest there. Thither he was followed, not many weeks after, by his poor, broken-hearted father.<sup>2</sup>

With the defection of Niall Garbh, and the death of Manus came the turning point in Red Hugh's career. Hitherto his had been one swift course, one unbroken series of conquests.

But as worldly successes without worldly reverses and happiness without eclipse are not pleasing to the one God, He permitted a check to the race of Lughaid, son of Setna . . . So it happened to Hugh O'Donnell and his brothers, whom the Lord checked in the course of their victories, and he gave them the Kingdom of Heaven afterwards.<sup>3</sup>

If Nuala thought she had known the uttermost depths of human misery when she saw her brother, the consecrated chieftain of their lordly race, betrayed by her husband, the ancient territory of Tyrconnell laid bare by his treachery to the English enemy, her young brother Manus slain at Niall's hands, and her father dead of grief at the loss of that bright youth, she was wrong. There was a grief and a shame yet more bitter reserved for her—and it came upon her, suddenly, blackly, on the day when she heard that her husband, repeating the dastardly deed of the English captains, Willis and Conell, during Red Hugh's captivity, had driven 'into the woods and winding glens as if they were wolves and wild beasts,' the friars of St. Francis from

<sup>1</sup> O'Clery, p. 261.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 263

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp. 259-261.



the monastery built for them by another Hugh Roe and another Nuala, and made of the holy place a garrison for ruffianly soldiers.<sup>1</sup>

The news brought Red Hugh swiftly back from Con-nacht, whither he had gone to meet in battle Richard, the new Earl of Clanricarde. He proceeded to besiege Niall Garbh and his English auxiliaries so closely in the monastery that they were reduced to desperate straits. On Michaelmas Eve, of the year 1601, the powder stored in the church exploded, and in the ensuing fire the noble sanctuary was reduced to ruins.

Nevertheless, Niall managed to get reinforcements, and by the aid of the guns of the garrison which he had planted in Donegal Castle, as well as those from a battle-ship in the bay, which had sailed to his help from the English in Derry, he still held out in the monastery until Red Hugh was forced to raise the siege and hasten southward at the news of the landing of the Spaniards under Don Juan D'Aquila at Kinsale.<sup>2</sup>

With all Tyrconnell in Niall Garbh's hands, and the great cause nigh its final defeat at Kinsale, where did Nuala and her mother find shelter? We know nothing. There were greater things to chronicle in those tragic years than the place where two women hid themselves and their broken hearts. In what words was the message couched that Red Hugh sent them when he sailed away to Spain after Kinsale? And who brought them the tidings of his death at Simancas?

In 1603, Hugh O'Neill, recognizing that the struggle was now hopeless, made his submission to the English Government, and about the same time (or rather somewhat earlier) Ruairi, who was now the Chief of the O'Donnells, sued for pardon and received back his estates, with the new title of Earl of Tyrconnell. A little later, he married the Lady Brigid, daughter of the Earl of Kildare.

The news was very bitter to Niall Garbh, who considered that Tyrconnell was rightfully his own, and had got himself proclaimed 'The O'Donnell' at Kilmacrenan. Now, to his wrathful amazement, he saw himself 'the outlaw,' and his cousin's title recognized by the English. A warrant was issued for his arrest, but he fled to the woods of Kinnaweer, and remained lurking there until he was allowed

<sup>1</sup> O'Clery, p. 285.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. pp. 285-293.

to go to London, where King James made him a grant of the lands he had held while in amity with the late Hugh Roe O'Donnell. Here he lived for a few years, preying on the cattle and lands of his kinsman, when the occasion presented itself, a willing enough instrument in the scheme of persecution which the hungry enemies of Earl Ruairi had devised for driving him from his estates, ready to give information when the Government wanted it, ready to play jackal to the English lion.<sup>1</sup>

This is not the place to tell of the working out of the nefarious scheme which finally drove from their homes for ever the great chieftains of Tyrone and Tyrconnell. Suffice it to say that, though ostensibly pardoned, the lives of Hugh O'Neill and Earl Ruairi were made unbearable by a system of petty persecution and spying. They were fettered in the exercise of their religion; rebellious vassals were stirred up against them; in a hundred ways galling to their pride they were crossed and thwarted. Finally, a plot was formed to convict them of treasonable conspiracy, but information of this plot having reached Colonel Henry O'Neill in Flanders, he sent them urgent warnings to save their lives by flight to the Continent. By his aid, Cuconnacht Maguire chartered a boat and sailed into Lough Swilly in it, ostensibly for fishing, but in reality to convey the Earls and their families away from Ireland for ever.

So, on a September day of the fatal year 1607, from that same harbour of Rathmullen whence Red Hugh had once been borne to his captivity, there sailed forth the 'Ship of Calamity' bearing away the Chieftains—the noblest of the Gaels. 'A distinguished company was this for one ship' cry the grieving Four, 'for it is certain that the sea never carried, and that the winds never wafted from the Irish shores, individuals more illustrious or noble in genealogy, or more renowned for deeds of valour, prowess, and high achievements.'

In that noble company there went with the chieftains themselves, Hugh O'Neill and Ruairi O'Donnell, and Cuconnacht Maguire, a great number of their kinsfolk. With the O'Neill there went, beside his eldest son, Hugh, Baron of Dungannon, his Countess, the Lady Catriona MacGuinness,

<sup>1</sup> 'Declaration of Grievances of Earl of Tyrconnell' (published by Father Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, pp. 130 et seq., from document in Public Record Office, London).



and her two little boys, Brian and John, many of his nephews and grandchildren, his secretary, Henry Hovendon, his master of the horse, Christopher Plunkett, two of the O'Hagans<sup>1</sup> (Henry and Sean), O'Quinn, his marshall, and many other gentlemen of his suite, including a Spaniard, who had lived in his household since the wreck of the Armada. With Ruari O'Donnell were his little year old son Hugh (called the Baron of Donegal), his brother Cathbar, Cathbar's wife, the Lady Rosa O'Doherty, their little son, another Hugh, and our heroine, the Lady Nuala. (The Countess Brigid, who was in Maynooth at the time of the flight, was necessarily left behind, with a daughter yet unborn.) With kinsfolk, followers, serving-men and pages, and the three waiting-women for the three ladies, there were in all in that little eighty-ton vessel, ninety-nine persons.

One of the ninety-nine was Tadg O'Cianain, chronicler to the family of the Maguire, and to his pen we owe a vivid account of the voyage.<sup>2</sup> They went on board about mid-day on Friday, 14th September, the Feast of Holy Cross—but did not leave the harbour until nightfall, as they had to send men on shore for wood and water. The boat party that landed were attacked by some of the people of MacSwiney Fanad, and had to make a hasty retreat to the ship. Their next intention was to put in at the island of Aranmore to complete the provisioning of their ship, but a terrible storm arose and drove them far out to sea.

They ran into the full fury of the equinoctial gales that rage so fiercely on this Western Ocean, and for thirteen days their small barque was tossed like a cockle-shell from crest to trough of the huge Atlantic billows. What torture must have been endured by the three delicately nurtured ladies, the Countess O'Neill, Lady Rosa, and Lady Nuala, and the little children, shut up for days in the close cabin of that small vessel, not knowing at what moment their frail craft might perish. The mother-hearts of the Countess and Lady Rosa had to grieve for two little ones<sup>3</sup> left behind them in

<sup>1</sup> The O'Hagans were the erenachs of the O'Neills, and had the privilege of inaugurating the Chieftain at Tullahogue. Sean was the Earl's rent-gatherer.

<sup>2</sup> Edited with translation and notes from MS. in the Franciscan Library, Dublin, by Rev. Paul Walsh, and published as Appendix to *Archivium Hibernicum*, vols. ii., iii., iv. (Maynooth, 1913, 1914, 1915).

<sup>3</sup> Little Con O'Neill, and Cathbar O'Donnell's son, whose name is not given, were with fosterers too far away to be taken in their fathers' flight. Con finally perished in the Tower of London, the fate of Cathbar's son is not known.

Ireland to an unknown fate—as well as for the frightened and sick children whose wailings filled the evil-smelling and dark cabin. Their waiting-women, half dead with seasickness and terror, were useless, and if ever Nuala needed ‘the heart of a hero, and the soul of a soldier,’ it was surely now.

Then, when the storm was at its worst, God had mercy on their misery. O'Neill, with strong Irish faith, took from his neck a golden relic case containing a portion of the True Cross, and trailed it in the sea. And, lo! a sudden calm fell, and the ladies and children were able to leave the cabin and come on deck for a time. Then a curious thing happened. Two small hawks, merlins—little land birds driven far out to sea—alighted on the ship and, hungry and storm-weary, allowed themselves to be caught and fed. As Lady Nuala poised them on her delicate wrist for the amusement of her small nephews, did she see in them messengers of consolation, reminders of the kind Providence, Who, for the storm-tossed starving ones on board that little ship, was able to provide safe landing at last!

As the wind still blew ‘straight against the ship’ in her course for Spain, and their supply of food and drink was nearly exhausted, the master of the ship, Captain Bath, after consultation with O'Neill, determined to make for France. But they had some days of misery and anxiety yet to endure before they landed, on the Feast of St. Francis, at Quillebœuf, near Rouen, in the Estuary of the Seine. They had been exactly three weeks at sea.

There is not space here to tell of their adventures as they passed through France, on their way to Flanders. The English Ambassador at the Court of Henry IV did his best to persuade that monarch to allow him to arrest the Irish nobles and send them, prisoners, to England. But Henry, apart from his soldierly admiration<sup>1</sup> for O'Neill's military genius, had too royal a conception of the dignity of France to lend himself to any such outrage. ‘France is free,’ he said to the English Ambassador.<sup>2</sup> But at the same time he had no mind to embroil himself with England, and

<sup>1</sup> Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, p. 81. n., quoted from Camden (*Apol.*, l. 1181): ‘Henry IV used to call O'Neill the third soldier of his age, thus implying that he himself was the first, and the Conde de Fuentes the second.’

<sup>2</sup> Salisbury to Lord Shrewsbury, 12-22 October, 1607: ‘The English Ambassador, wishing Henry to stay them, had for answer, “France is free”’ (*Cal. State Papers*, 1607).



he sent word to O'Neill and his party to hasten their journey through France as much as they possibly could.

In Flanders, in spite of the honourable reception they met with from 'the Archdukes,' and the joyful greetings from their exiled kinsmen and countrymen who were serving in the Spanish army in the Low Countries, or studying at the new colleges which had been established for Irish students, it was made equally plain to them that Spanish politics did not permit of their long abiding. The intention of the chieftains to go to the Court of King Philip III at Madrid was declared equally unacceptable to that monarch. In fact they were actually turned back by his command, having started on their journey thither. In this humiliating moment, when the Earls were made to feel unmistakably that they were wanted nowhere, news came from Peter Lombard, the exiled Archbishop of Armagh, that there was one monarch who was willing to harbour them—and that was the Royal Pope, Paul V himself. To Rome, therefore, they set out on the 28th February, 1608, having spent the winter in Louvain.

It was thought wise to leave the children in Louvain for their education, and Father Meehan assumes that Lady Nuala stayed there with them. But there is no support for this assertion in O'Keenan's narrative, which states: 'On Thursday, 28th February, 1608, the princes, with their retinue, set out for Italy, in all thirty-two, riding on horseback. Their ladies had a coach. They left two of O'Neill's sons, Sean and Brian, the Baron, the Earl of Tyrconnell's son, Aodh, the son of Cathbar, O'Coinne and Sean O'Hagan and others of their nobles and followers in Flanders with the Colonel' (i.e. Henry O'Neill, Lady Siobhan's second son).

O'Keenan's narrative of the journey from Louvain to Rome is just as vivid and picturesque as that of the preceding stages. They followed the route through Lorraine and Alsace, treading, had they but known it, in the footsteps of other illustrious Irish exiles, St. Columbanus and St. Dichuill, and having come into Switzerland passed through Basle and Lucerne and crossed the Alps by the St. Gothard Pass. In the cold spring weather the crossing must have been very difficult. 'Because,' says O'Keenan, 'of the snow and ruggedness and ice of the mountain they were scarcely able to ride the next day, except in the way that is usual when crossing the Alps. There were strong oxen with sleighs yoked to them bringing all of them that could not travel over the hard road.'

Once in Italy their journey was pleasant and full of interest. They spent Holy Week in Milan, and received every honour from the Spanish Governor of that city, the Conde de Fuentes, who, a great soldier himself, shared King Henry's admiration for O'Neill's military genius. Piacenza, Parma, Bologna, Rimini, Pesaro, Ancona, threw wide hospitable gates open to them. From Ancona they went on pious pilgrimage to the Holy House of Loreto. They passed through Umbria, and the 'places' sweetened by the memory of St. Francis, and finally arrived in Rome in the beginning of May.

Their reception left nothing to be desired. As they rode over the Milvian Bridge, they found awaiting them, not only their own countryman, Peter Lombard, but several Cardinals and great Roman nobles. Splendid carriages had been provided for them, and in these O'Neill and O'Donnell and the ladies of their party rode into the city to the Palazzo that had been provided for them in the Borgo.

For a little time Lady Nuala, in the prayerful atmosphere of Rome, may have tasted a quiet happiness. After the weariness of long wanderings it was bliss to be at rest. And when she lifted the leathern door-screens of the historic churches, and passed from the flowers and sunshine of the streets into their cool, incense-scented gloom, there was a delicious sense of home-coming. She sat with the greatest ladies of Rome on the balcony of some famous palace, and saw her brothers and her nephew carry the canopy over the Pope in the Corpus Christi Procession. The Pope's niece called for her and the Countess and Lady Rosa, and carried them off in her own coach to see the illuminations of San Pietro, and the fireworks in Sant' Angelo, on the evening of the day of the Canonization of Santa Francesca Romana. Every delicate attention which Italian courtesy could devise was lavished on her and hers.

But, alas! her quiet happiness was not to be of long duration. Disquieting news came from Ireland, which wrung with anguish the hearts of the exiles, and especially of Nuala and Lady Rosa. It was the news of young Sir Cahir O'Doherty's ill-fated insurrection and death, and of the consequent confiscation of Inishowen. Ineen Dubh, eating out her desolate heart in loneliness at home, had stooped to revenge herself on her wretched son-in-law Niall Garbh, by offering Montgomery, the Protestant Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, informations which would



implicate Niall in Sir Cahir’s rebellion. Surely Nuala could not hear that tale unmoved. Presently came tidings that Sir Richard Wingfield had arrested Niall Garbh, his son Neachtan, and his two brothers, and committed them to the dungeons of Dublin Castle. Hence, after a year (to end his wretched story as quickly as may be), Niall made a desperate attempt to escape, and was transferred to the Tower of London. Sixteen years did he linger here, half-starved, clad in rags—and surely, if he were human at all, the victim of passionate remorse.<sup>1</sup>

Even yet Nuala had not drained her chalice of woe. The summer in Rome was very trying to the Irish exiles, already much weakened by their long journey, and in June Earl Ruairi sickened with fever. It was thought that the cool sea breezes of Ostia might bring him healing, and accordingly he removed there in company with his brother Cathbar, his nephew Hugh, Baron of Dungannon, and O’Carroll of Moydristan, their physician. But the change did no good, and early in July he returned to Rome, where he died on 28th July, 1608, aged only three and thirty years.

In September of same year Cathbar died in his twenty-fifth year, leaving Lady Rosa a young widow of eighteen. And exactly a year later Hugh, Baron of Dungannon, closed his earthly career at the age of four and twenty. One after another the princely ones had been borne, clothed in the habit of St. Francis, to the tomb in the Church of San Pietro in Montorio on the Janiculum. And here Nuala, the last of the children of Ineen Dubh, kneeling one day, raised her voice in the ‘piercing wail’ which tears our hearts asunder, even to-day, as the echoing harp of the poet carries it over three centuries.

With her brother and her nephew dead, there was nothing to keep Nuala in Rome. She and Lady Rosa would seem to have returned to Louvain shortly after the death of Baron Hugh. The two little Hughs, sons of Ruairi and Cathbar, were now the only two left to the desolate ladies, and it was but natural they should wish to be near them. In Louvain, Lady Rosa, who, as we have seen, was only about eighteen when she lost her husband, was destined to find happiness again, for, as we all know, she married Owen Roe O’Neill.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, pp. 196, 198, 219-222.

<sup>2</sup> The Epitaph of Lady Rosa (given by Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, p. 337) shows she was born in 1590.

Lady Nuala's happiness was bound up in her little nephew, who, since the death of his father Ruairi, was in her eyes now the head of the family. The final glimpse of her, disclosed to us in a letter of William Turnbull to King James, shows her using her skill in 'wise grave speech' in a vain attempt to get the boy restored to his father's estates in Ireland. The attempt failed, and young Hugh followed his cousin Colonel Henry's example and entered the Spanish service.

We have no record of the date of Lady Nuala's death, but we know from an 'obit,' written in the fly-leaf of *The Martyrology of Donegal*, that she found burial with her ward and nephew Hugh 'at the foot of the high altar' in the Franciscan Church, Louvain.<sup>1</sup>

Father Paul Walsh has published in his *Gleanings from Irish Manuscripts* a poem by Ferghal Og Mac an Bhaird, in which the poet condoles with two ladies, Maire and Mairghread, apparently two other sisters of Nuala, whom they survive. I was wrong, therefore, in counting only two girls in the family. In this poem Nuala's grave, according to one reading, is in Italy, according to another in Spain.

H. CONCANNON.

<sup>1</sup> Meehan, *Flight of the Earls*, p. 337 n. Father Meehan thinks the 'obit' is in the handwriting of Colgan the great hagiologist.



## A FRIAR AT COURT

THOMAS RUSHOOK, O.P., BISHOP OF LLANDAFF,  
CHICHESTER AND KILMORE, 1383-1393

BY REV. WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P.

THE life of an ecclesiastic at a Plantagenet Court was frequently a stormy one, and though the Ship of State weathered many gales, the pilot was often thrown overboard. Simon of Sudbury, the Primate, and not a few other prelates, repented too late of their share in politics. Amongst those must be numbered Thomas Rushook, friar, courtier, and bishop. He was Provincial of the Dominicans at a period when his Order was extremely powerful, both in Church and State. In the latter half of the fourteenth century we find thirty dioceses in the British Isles ruled by Dominicans. Friars went to and fro on embassies to the various courts of Europe; they sat in the Privy Council; and even held high office in the Government. During this period John Gilbert, a Blackfriar of Guildford, twice held the post of Lord High Treasurer.

Rushook, who took no small part in this political influence, first comes under our notice as prior of the convent of Hereford in 1351.<sup>1</sup> At the time of his appointment the community were engaged in a seemingly interminable lawsuit with the townsfolk, concerning the enclosure of a small thoroughfare known as Frog Lane. The friars, it appears, wanted the lane in order to extend their site; but the project raised a storm of opposition. The cathedral clergy and the important townsmen, all suddenly found that the lane was indispensable. The canons declared that they would not be able to collect their rents; citizens said that they could not water their horses—all the world seemed to find the small lane a *sine qua non* of a peaceful and prosperous existence. The struggle began in 1325, and several

<sup>1</sup> Palmer, 'Blackfriars of Hereford' in *Reliquary*, July 1882, p. 19-20.

inquisitions declared the enclosure impossible; but the friars persevered, and in an inquisition, held in 1334, the jurors found that the lane could be enclosed without detriment. At the very moment of success the royal council sitting at Newcastle-on-Tyne quashed the project, so that nothing was done till 1351. This year a royal grant was made out, empowering the Hereford Dominicans to appropriate the disputed property.<sup>1</sup> They accordingly built a wall at both ends of the lane and were thereupon sued for damages by a certain chaplain of Preston, Robert Urry, who had property at both ends of the thoroughfare, and reasonably objected to the extra mile he now had to walk in order to attend to his land. Eventually the friars overreached the citizens by surrendering the lane to the crown, and Edward III restored it to them in May, 1358, on condition that they celebrated annually a solemn dirge for the repose of the soul of his murdered father, Edward II.

As Rushook was prior of Hereford we may safely conclude that he was a native of the small village of that name near Hereford. One of the priests of the convent at this time was John de Rushook, perhaps a relation of the Prior.

We do not meet Rushook again till 1374, when we find him present as Provincial at a council held at Westminster by the king's command to enquire into the Pope's claims to the temporal suzerainty of England.<sup>2</sup> All the available lords, temporal and spiritual, came to the meeting. The bishops were led by the Primate William Wittesley, and at the head of the nobles came the Black Prince, representing his father Edward III. Both Prince and Primate sat in the middle of the sanctuary, with the nobles and bishops ranged on each side of them. Seated on a bench facing this distinguished company were four Masters in Theology, Thomas Rushook, Provincial of the Dominicans, John Owtred, a monk of Durham, John Mardesley, a Franciscan, and Thomas Ashbourne, an Austin Friar.<sup>3</sup> Lawyers and clerks were grouped about on the carpet between the two seated parties. The first hearing was given to the lords spiritual, who all agreed with the Archbishop in declaring that the Pope was the lord of all. 'Ipse est omnium dominus, non possum hoc negare' said His Grace of Canterbury. Rushook was then called upon to give his opinion as a theologian,

<sup>1</sup> Pat. 25, Edward III. p. 1, m. 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Eulogium Historiarum*, III. 337 seq. Rolls Series.

<sup>3</sup> For the three latter vide *National Biography*, xx, 17; xii, 1013; xix, 655.



which, however, he was far too prudent to do, and cunningly suggested that, in accordance with the custom of his Order in business of great moment, they should go and sing the Mass of the Holy Ghost or at least intone the *Veni Creator Spiritus*. The Durham Benedictine, being made of sterner stuff, was not afraid of taking up the argument, quoting the text : 'Behold here are two swords' (Luke xxii, 39), from which he argued that our Lord gave to Peter both spiritual and temporal domain. The Franciscan capped the text with another : 'Put up thy sword into the scabbard' (John xvii, 2) inferring from this reply of Our Lord that the temporal claims of the Pope were invalid. The Archbishop, very much annoyed, remarked that 'without the friars there had been good counsel in England,' but the Black Prince rudely replied that they were assembled there owing to his foolishness and if they followed his counsel the kingdom would be lost. This tilt of words closed the proceedings for the day, and at their meeting on the morrow the Archbishop confessed that he knew not how to answer. 'Answer, you donkey,' burst out the Prince, 'you ought to instruct us.' The latter's temper must have carried him away or he would have seen the reflection he cast on himself and the other members of the council. Thus rudely admonished, Wittesley replied that he did not wish the Pope to be lord in England, and so said all the other prelates. The temporal lords, on their side, maintained that King John had surrendered England to the Pope without the consent of the realm and consequently it was not a legitimate grant. This brought the business of the council to a close, and a reply unfavourable to his claims was despatched to Gregory XI.

Rushook seems to have led a fairly quiet existence till his appointment as confessor to the boy-king Richard II, in 1377. As he thus rose in dignity outside the Order, his position amongst his religious brethren suffered a total eclipse, because he was deposed from the provincialship by the Master-General, Elias Raymond, a Frenchman. The latter had made a canonical visitation of the English Province some six years previously (1372), in which visitation he had issued several severe ordinances for the advancement of regular life and discipline. Finding that those had not been observed, the General deposed the Provincial from office, and this drastic course of action was approved by the General Chapter of the Order assembled at Carcassonne

in 1378.<sup>1</sup> John Paris, a celebrated doctor of Cambridge, was chosen Vicar-General of England pending a new election, and Robert Cusack was nominated Vicar in Ireland in place of John of Leicester, who had been appointed by Rushook. In addition to these changes many other friars, holding high offices in the Province, were included in this sentence, being dispossessed both of office and dignity. The most prominent of these was William Bottlesham or Bottisham, formerly Provincial, who lost his rank and privileges; but, was no loser in the long run, as he subsequently received four bishoprics and died as 'My Lord of Rochester' in 1400.<sup>2</sup> All these harsh measures were frustrated by the schism of the West, which began in August, 1378, only three months after the Chapter at Carcassonne. The Master-General, being a Frenchman, acknowledged the claims of the anti-pope Clement VII (Cardinal Robert of Geneva), who was obeyed by all France. The English Government felt itself bound to follow Urban VI, the Roman Pontiff, thus leaving Scotland no other choice than to recognise Clement. Because Germany preferred Urban, Spain adhered to his rival. The Italian kingdoms, principedoms, duchies and republics followed their own little politics, and settled down to an exciting struggle. England thus found herself committed to Rome, perhaps by accident, though we must admit that the reply of Richard's Government to the French Cardinals was logical enough to make their ears tingle.<sup>3</sup> Rushook's prospects improved, now that he was freed from the authority of Elias Raymond. Urban VI, not disdaining to do a good turn to so considerable a personage as the English king's confessor, appointed a commission to enquire into the validity of his deposition. The commission, presided over by Cardinal Carracciolo Moschino, an Italian Dominican, delivered judgment in Rushook's favour on August 25th, 1379. His dismissal from office was declared null and void and he was reinstated in power.<sup>4</sup> Elias Raymond, on his side, assembled a General Chapter of the Order in the Avignon Obedience at Lausanne, 1380, in which he declared John Paris to be true Vicar-General of the English Province.<sup>5</sup> In a later Chapter, held at Rodez in 1388, he

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Capitulorum Generalium*, ed. Reichert, ii, 450-454.

<sup>2</sup> *National Biography*, ii, 909.

<sup>3</sup> Raynaldus, ad. an., 1379, No. 51.

<sup>4</sup> *Cal. of Patent Rolls*, Richard II, i, 310.

<sup>5</sup> *Acta Cap. Gen.*, iii, 3.



declaimed against all who had accepted the authority of the anti-pope Bartholomew (Urban VI) and the anti-Master-General (Blessed Raymund of Capua), and specially against the English friars who had accepted the ruling of the anti-cardinal Nicholas Mosquino (sic.). Moreover, he ordered all the members of the Province to accept as Provincial John of Lancaster.<sup>1</sup> This show of indignation and spite had of course no effect and even Paris and Lancaster seem to have rejected his authority. Paris worked hand in hand with the other great Dominican doctors in England in refuting the errors of Wycliffe, to which work they had been strongly urged by the Roman Master-General (Blessed Raymond of Capua), whilst Lancaster ruled the Province about the year 1400, when all the friars accepted the Roman Pope.<sup>2</sup> Rushook held office again till 1382, when, contrary to all precedent, he resigned, in order to accept the Archdeaconry of St. Asaph.<sup>3</sup> Already, in 1380, he had been appointed Chirographer in the Common Bench and this he exchanged in 1381 for a pension of £40.<sup>4</sup> He was now beginning that upward career which was to end in disappointment and bitterness. Already, in 1381, he was unpopular with Parliament, who charged him to abstain from coming to the king's lodging and staying there, except on the four principal feasts of the year. They had before urged in vain his dismissal from the office of confessor.<sup>5</sup> Despite this opposition Rushook maintained his position and mounted his first step to real greatness in 1383, when he was appointed to the see of Llandaff by Urban VI, at the King's request. The temporalities were restored to him on April 2nd, and on May 3rd he was consecrated by Archbishop Courtenay in the Dominican church at Ludgate. One of the assistant Prelates was William Wykeham of Winchester, the famous Lord Chancellor.<sup>6</sup> The new bishop retained his post as confessor to the king, and took, as his companion, Friar John Burghill, who in his turn was to become royal confessor and bishop of Llandaff. Burghill, who also became bishop of Lichfield, was the only prelate found bold enough to preside at the funeral of the unfortunate Richard II at King's Langley in 1400.<sup>7</sup> Though Rushook was now in affluent

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Cap. Gen.* iii, 41-42.

<sup>2</sup> *English Hist. Review*, April, 1918, p. 347.

<sup>3</sup> Palmer, 'Provincials, O.P.' *Archæol. Journal*, 1878, vol. xxxv, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* and *National Biography*.

<sup>5</sup> Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, ii, 462, n. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Stubbs, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, p. 59, ed. 1848.

<sup>7</sup> Walsingham, *Hist. Anglice.*, ii, 246. Rolls Series.

circumstances he and his companion were still provided for from the royal purse. A gift of new habits and cloaks tells us the interesting fact that the friar-bishop wore the regular habit of his Order rather than the sumptuous dress affected by his secular brothers in the hierarchy.

There is nothing to record of Rushook's rule at Llandaff, because, as far as we can gather, he did not reside there, but followed the Court about from place to place and formed one of the episcopal minority that supported Richard in his struggle against his uncle Gloucester and other powerful nobles. The majority of the bishops were opposed to the king, choosing rather to support the great families from which they had sprung. Rushook was rewarded for his fidelity by promotion to the see of Chichester, a richer and more important diocese than Llandaff.<sup>1</sup> He was now a keen politician, but had he known where politics would lead him he would have retired to his bishopric and ended his days caring for the flock committed to him.

In the Parliament of 1386, Gloucester's party, being all-powerful, brought about the fall of the Chancellor and Treasurer. Bishop Arundel of Ely, the king's enemy, became Chancellor, and John Gilbert, Bishop of Hereford, received charge of the Treasury. Gilbert, a Dominican, like Rushook, was also a keen politician, but in the opposite camp, though one of the more moderate of the king's opponents, so that when Richard assumed the supreme power, he retained him in office.<sup>2</sup> Gloucester's parliament appointed a commission to reform and regulate the king's household, which, doubtless, was a very extensive programme. The commission consisted of the new Chancellor and Treasurer and the Lord Privy Seal, together with eleven lords, spiritual and temporal. It included several men of moderate tendencies, such as Bishops Wykeham, Gilbert, and Scrope, men not likely to carry things too far, and had Richard been better advised by his friends, he might, instead of opposing the commission, have obtained several advantages from it. But the king was only twenty, and headstrong as any youth. At the suggestion of his friends, amongst whom must be included Rushook, Richard attempted to raise an armed force with which to overthrow the parliament and the nobles; for which purpose he made a tour of the country, hoping to draw the common people

<sup>1</sup> Stubbs, *Reg.* 59. *Gams. Series Episcoporum*, 184.

<sup>2</sup> Stubbs, *Constitutional History*. iii. 474.



to his standard. At Nottingham he held a meeting of his partisans, at which five of the royal justices declared the parliamentary commission to be illegal and contrary to the rights of the crown. This statement was witnessed and signed by several prelates, including Rushook. The latter, in fact, seems to have had no small part in this business, for he was accused later on of browbeating and threatening the justices in order to force from them an answer favourable to the king's demands.<sup>1</sup> This meeting was intended to have been kept secret, but was divulged to the Duke of Gloucester. Meanwhile a rash attempt had been made to arrest some of the nobles, whereupon Gloucester took alarm and marched in force on London, in November, 1387. Richard was powerless to defend himself or his friends, the majority of whom were forthwith arrested. A parliament entirely under the influence of the king's enemies met in February and proceeded to condemn Richard's adherents, some of whom were executed whilst the rest were exiled. Amongst the latter were the five royal justices who had declared against Gloucester's Commission. They were first condemned to death, but, at the intercession of the bishops, were spared the supreme penalty. Their chief defence was that they had been forced into their action by threats of the Bishop of Chichester. Rushook was thereupon arraigned on March 5th by the lords and commons.<sup>2</sup> He denied the use of threats and pleaded an obligation of secrecy concerning the answers given at Nottingham, adding, however, that he had taken care no evil should arise from the affair. But the whole parliament was in a fever heat of fury against him, and debated as to whether he should be put to death or merely exiled. They decided that, as they could not take his life, at least, before he was degraded from his ecclesiastical rank, they would deprive him of his temporal possessions. This severe measure was, however, very far from satisfying their vengeance on one whom they regarded as one of the most guilty of all the meddlers in the Nottingham meeting, so that on the morrow they made another savage attack on him. He was impeached of treason in the presence of all the spiritual lords, and had not these latter, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, stood firm in his defence, he would certainly have lost his life. His cause was thereupon deferred till May 12th, on

<sup>1</sup> Higden's *Polychronicon*. ix. 101. Rolls Series.

<sup>2</sup> Higden, ix. 169 seq.

which day he was solemnly summoned three times to the bar of the house to receive sentence. This sentence, read out by the Chief Justice, Walter Clifton, is given in French by Higden, and may be freely translated as follows : ' It is well known to you that you are accused by the Commons of the realm, to which you have replied, and the accusations and your answers have been well examined by the peers of the realm with great deliberation, and you are found guilty of treason, wherefore all the peers of the realm, the lords temporal, have by the consent of the king, adjudged you as traitor to the king and his realm, and all your lands and tenements, goods and chattels, are forfeited to the king. And as to the execution of your body the king will be advised.'<sup>1</sup> The result of this last sinister phrase was banishment to Ireland for life, with the city of Cork and its environs as his residence, at which he was to arrive at the end of September. His friends, if he could find such, were to be allowed to give him forty marks a year, and he was empowered to take a like sum with him for his first year's maintenance ; also he was permitted to take his breviary, bed, and two servants, but the unfortunate prelate found, like Job, that friends were not always reliable, and not one of them opened his purse sufficiently wide to allow such a sum to fall out.<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Neville, of York, was also implicated in this political persecution, in which, like Rushook, he lost all his possessions. Pope Urban VI, either at the request of the Government, who wanted the sees of York and Chichester to be vacated canonically, or perhaps out of pity for the two bishops, translated Neville to St. Andrew's in Scotland, and Rushook to Kilmore in Ireland.<sup>3</sup> Neville, of course, could not obtain possession of his new see, and was glad to earn the stipend of a curate in Louvain. Rushook, though more fortunate in obtaining a diocese, found the revenues so small and his friends so uncharitable that he was only too glad to accept assistance from the Government, which, relieved of his undesirable presence, now graciously allowed him forty marks per annum out of the royal exchequer. This was granted on March 10th, 1389. In May, Richard, by a bold stroke, overturned the Government, and assumed absolute power. The king, however, had learned his lesson, so that he now acted with wise moderation. He

<sup>1</sup> Higden, 156, 157.

<sup>2</sup> *Rot. Parliam.* 241-244. Palmer, ' Provincials,' 23.

<sup>3</sup> Stubbs, *Reg.* 59 ; *Eubel. Hierarchia*, ed. 1899, p. 304.



did not restore his friends to their former positions, but did what he could to alleviate their exile. It was not till 1393 that he felt himself secure enough to brave public opinion by conferring favours on them. The last payment of Rushook's pension was in 1393, so that it is probable he died in that year. His death took place at Seal, in Kent, where he was buried, but no trace remains of his last resting place.<sup>1</sup> What he was doing in Kent when he should have been in Ireland we cannot say, but it is not impossible to suppose that by this time his sentence had been revoked.

Such is the brief outline of the life of one amongst the many episcopal politicians, who found to their cost that they had been playing with edged tools. They would have done better to have remained quietly in their Cathedral cities, than to have faced the storms at Court. Rushook, in particular, must have regretted leaving the cloister. He might have passed quietly and satisfactorily into oblivion, whereas his niche in history is not a very enviable one. The poet Gower, friend, but afterward enemy of Richard II, wrote in his *Tripartite Chronicle* all the evil he had heard or imagined of Richard's friends. What he says of Rushook is particularly unpleasant. English is too poor to express the full meaning of his Latin verse, but we hazard the following translation:—

Beneath the royal wing  
     is another such nestling,  
 An indulgent confessor  
     of crime a bland professor.  
 This one was a black friar,  
     in soul as in attire ;  
 And with his darkness stinks  
     the royal court methinks.  
 In him the lords did know  
     a crafty skulking foe,  
 Less ready to make peace  
     than anger to increase.  
 But at last he fled,  
     and earned himself instead,  
 What he had said of late  
     would be some other's fate.<sup>2</sup>

Without going anything like as far as Gower we can say truly that his public life was spent in seeking honours and power, all which turned to dust and ashes when attained.

WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P.

<sup>1</sup> Palmer, 'Provincials,' 23. *National Biography*, xvii, 417.

<sup>2</sup> *Political Poems*, i, 421. Rolls Series.

# DOCUMENTS

## MOTU PROPRIO ON THE CELEBRATION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF ST. JOSEPH AS PATRON OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

(July 25. 1920)

### MOTU PROPRIO

DE SACRIS SOLEMNIBUS ANNI QUINQUAGESIMI EX QUO S. IOSEPH B.M.V.  
SPONSUS ECCLESIAE CATHOLICAE PATRONUS RENUNTIATUS EST.

### BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Bonum sane et salutare fuit nomini christiano quod Decessor Noster immortalis memoriae Pius IX castissimum Virginis Deiparae Sponsum eundemque Verbi Incarnati Nutricium Ioseph Ecclesiae Catholicae Patronum declaravit; quae res quoniam decembri proximo quinquaginta erunt anni cum auspiciato evenerit, vehementer utile futurum ducimus si ea toto orbe terrarum solemnī commemoratione celebretur.

Respicientibus quidem hoc spatium praeteriti temporis, obversatur Nobis ante oculos continuatio quaedam seriesque pie institutorum, quae cultum sanctissimi Patriarchae apud Christi fideles sensim usque adhuc crevisse indicent: verum, intuentibus rerum acerbitates quibus hodie humanum genus conflictatur, hanc ipsam pietatem multo studiosius fovendi in populis, multoque latius propagari apparet oportere.—Etenim post tam gravem belli contentionem, quid ad communem ordinis tranquillitatem restituendam deesset, ostendimus nuper encyclicis illis litteris *de pacis reconciliatione christiana*, in quibus civiles potissimum tum populorum tum hominum inter ipsos rationes consideravimus. Nunc autem altera est perturbationis causa attendenda eaque longe maior, utpote quae in venis atque visceribus humanae societatis insideat. Scilicet eo tempore calamitas belli gentes occupavit, cum penitus eas *naturalismus* infecerat maxima illa saeculi lues, quae, ubi invaluit, caelestium bonorum desiderium debilitat, flammam divinae caritatis opprimit, hominem sananti et elevanti Christi gratiae subtrahit, eumque, fidei lumine denique orbatum et solis naturae infirmis corruptisque viribus instructum, effrenatis animi cupiditatibus permittit. Conversa igitur unice studia ad res caducas nimis multi mortales cum haberent, cumque proletarios inter et locupletes infensissimae aemulationes et similitates intercederent, mutuas classium inimicitias adauxit acrioresque reddidit belli diuturnitas et magnitudo, ideo praesertim quod hinc intolerandam



multitudini annonae caritatem, illinc subitam fortunarum affluentiam perpauca attulit.

Accedit eo in cumulum, ut coniugalis fidei sanctitas patriaeque potestatis verecundia non parum detrimenti apud plurimos bello ceperint, propterea quod et alterius coniugis longinquitas officiorum vincula in altero relaxaret, et custodis absentia temeritatem maxime puellarum ad indulgendum sibi licentius impelleret.—Itaque dolendum est multo esse magis, quam antea, corruptos depravatosque mores, eaque re ipsam *causam sociale* quae dicitur, ingravescere in dies adeo ut extrema iam sint malorum extimescenda. Est enim flagitiosissimi cuiusque votus atque expectationi maturus ortus cuiusdam universalis reipublicae, quae perfecta hominum aequalitate et bonorum communione, tamquam principiis innitatur, et in qua nec ulla sint nationum discrimina, nec patris in filios, nec publicae potestatis in cives, nec Dei agnoscat in homines consociatos auctoritas. Haec si deducantur in usum, miros terrores sequi necesse est; et eos nunc quidem non exigua Europae pars experitur ac sentit. Atqui condicionem eiusmodi ceteris etiam populis quaeri videmus, concitatisque paucorum furore et audacia plebibus, magnas hic illic turbas subinde exsistere.

Equidem hoc rerum cursu Nos in primis solliciti, Ecclesiae filios sui commonefacere officii ex occasione haud praetermisimus, ut datis proxime ad Episcopum Bergomatium litteris, itemque ad Venetae regionis Episcopos. Iam eandem ob causam ut nostros homines, quotquot ubique sunt, qui manu et labore victim sibi comarant, in officio retineamus, eosque a contagione socialismi, quo nihil christianae sapientiae est inimicius, intactos conservemus, eisdem praesertim Sanctum Ioseph perstudiose proponimus, quem peculiarem et vitae ducem observent et patronum colant.

Is enim simili, atque ipsi, vitae genere aetatem exegit: cuius ratione rei Christus Deus, cum esset aeterni Patris unigenitus, *fabri Filius* appellari voluit. At eam loci fortunaeque humilitatem quantis quamque excellentibus ornavit virtutibus; nimirum iis quibus elucere decebat eum, qui vir esset Mariae Immaculatae, quique Iesu Domini Pater putaretur.—Quare, Ioseph magistro, discant omnes praesentia, quae fluunt, sub lumine spectare futurorum, quae permanent; et humanae incommoda condicionis spe consolantes caelestium bonorum, ad ea, divinae voluntati obsequendo, id est, sobrie et iuste et pie vivendo, contendant. Quod autem proprie ad operarios attinet, placet ea referre quae Decessor Noster fel. rec. Leo XIII simili in causa edixit; sunt enim eiusmodi ut nihil aptius dici posse videatur: 'Harum cogitatione rerum debent erigere animos et aequa sentire egeni et quotquot manuum mercede vitam tolerant: quibus si emergere ex egestate et meliorem statum acquirere concessum est non repugnante iustitia, ordinem tamen providentia Dei constitutum subvertere, non ratio, non iustitia permittit. Immo vero ad vim descendere, et quicquam in hoc genere aggredi per seditionem et turbas,

stultum consilium est, mala illa ipsa efficiens plerumque graviora, quorum leniendorum causa suscipitur. Non igitur seditiosorum hominum promissis confidant inopes, si sapiunt, sed exemplo patrocini<sup>1</sup>que beati Iosephi, itemque materna Ecclesiae caritate, quae scilicet de illorum statu curam gerit quotidie maiorem.<sup>1</sup>

Crescente autem nostrorum religione erga Sanctum Ioseph, simul proclive factu est, ut eorum religio in Sacram Familiam Nazarethanam, cuius augustum Caput is fuit, capiat incrementum: alterum enim ex altero sua sponte efflorescit. Namque ab Ioseph ad Mariam recta deducimur, per Mariam autem ad omnis sanctitatis fontem, Iesum, qui domesticas virtutes suo ipsius in Ioseph et in Mariam obsequio consecravit. Ad haec vero tanta virtutum specimina omnino se christianae familiae renovent cupimus atque conforment. Ita, quoniam familiae fundamento communitas humani generis constituta est, cum societati domesticae plus firmitatis eius nimirum munitâ sanctius et castimonia et concordia et fide, eo ipso novum quoddam robur et novus quasi sanguis per omnia societatis humanae membra diffundetur, influente usque quaque virtute Christi; nec solum privatorum morum sequetur emendatio, sed etiam communis vitae civilisque disciplinae.

Nos igitur eius plurimum confisi patrocinio, cuius vigilantiae providentiaeque Deus Unigenam suum Incarnatum Virginemque Deiparam commendatos voluit, omnibus Catholici orbis Episcopis auctores sumus ut tam necessario rei christianae tempore fideles ad opem S. Ioseph eo vel studiosius implorandam cohortentur. Cum autem plures haec Apostolica Sedes modos probaverit sanctum Patriarcham venerandi, in primis quarta quaque feria et continenter per mensem proprium, eos omnes volumus in una quaque dioecesi, instante, sacrorum Antistite, quoad possit, frequentari. Sed praecipue, quoniam praesentissimus morientium adiutor merito habetur, cui Iesus ipse cum Maria morienti adfuerint, Verenabilium Fratrum erit illa piorum sodalitia, quae Ioseph pro decedentibus exorando condita sunt, ut *a Bona Morte*, ut *a Transitu S. Ioseph*, ut *pro Agonizantibus*, omni auctoritatis suae suffragio et favore prosequi.

Ad memoriam vero celebrandam pontificalis Decreti, quod supra memoratum est, praecipimus et mandamus, ut intra annum a die viii mensis Decembris proximi, toto orbe catholico, in honorem S. Ioseph B. M. V. Sponsi, Ecclesiae Catholicae Patroni, quo et tempore et modo cuique Episcopo videbitur, solemnis supplicatio fiat; cui quotquot interfuerint, eis singulis plenariam peccatorum veniam, usitatis conditionibus, lucrari licebit.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, die xxv mensis Iulii, in festo S. Iacobi Apostoli, anno MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Encycl. *Quamquam pluries*.



**INSTRUCTION OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE REGARDING THE ERECTION OF QUASI-PARISHES IN VICARIATES AND PRAEFECTURES APOSTOLIC**

*(July 25, 1920)*

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

**INSTRUCTIO.**

CIRCA ERECTIONEM QUASI-PAROECIARUM IN VICARIATIBUS ET PRAEFECTURIS APOSTOLICIS.

Cum a pluribus Vicariis et Praefectis Apostolicis huic S. Consilio Christiano Nomini Propagando dubia quaedam de quasi-paroeciis earumque erectione proposita fuerint ; ad ea tollenda atque ad optatam in agendo uniformitatem inducendam, opportunum visum est sequentes tradere normas, fideliter et diligenter servandas.

1) Ea est sacrorum Canonum mens ut cuiusvis seu Vicariatus Apostolici seu Praefecturae territorium in distinctas partes dividatur, quarum singulae determinatum populum, cum propria ecclesia et peculiari pastore, habeant (can. 216, § 2). Quare Vicarii Praefectique Apostolici eo tendere debent ut Missionem sibi concreditam ad hanc suscipiendam aptae constitutionis formam adducant, et, ubi iudicaverint ad eam divisionem procedi posse, id perficere non omittant.

2) Non praepropere tamen et inconsiderate urgenda est divisio, praesertim si ea quae necessaria sunt, praevideantur defutura (can. 1415, § 3). Prae oculis in primis habeant Vicarii et Praefecti Apostolici, in erigendis quasi-paroeciis, utilitatem animarum et quibus incrementis res catholica in suis regionibus adoleverit. Res hinc serio examinetur, audita, ad normam can. 302, Consiliariorum sententia, vel etiam praecipuorum Missionariorum in congressu adunatorum, prout in can. 303 statuitur.

3) Neque tamen necesse est aut suadendum ut tempus exspectetur quo totum Vicariatus vel Praefecturae territorium in quasi-paroecias dispertiri possit ; pedetentim enim et per partes utiliter etiam proceditur, ita ut una pars in quasi-paroecias dividatur, alterius partis divisione in opportunius tempus dilata.

4) Erectio quasi-paroeciae fiat per decretum Ordinarii, quo clare describantur territorii limites. Ubi vero practice hoc obtineri non possit, sufficit declarasse quae christianitates ad singulas quasi-paroecias pertineant. Decreto insuper statuatur quae sit ecclesia principalis quasi-paroeciae, nec non residentia quasi-parochi.

5) Huius decreti bina exemplaria conficiantur, quorum unum in archivo Vicariatus vel Praefecturae Apostolicae, alterum in novae erectae quasi-paroeciae actis adservetur.

6) Constituta quasi-paroecia, ipso facto oriuntur iura et obligationes quasi-parochi, quae a Codice iuris canonici sanciantur (vid. praesertim canones 451, § 2, I ; 454, § 4 ; 456 ; 456 ; 459 ; 461 ; 1356 ; 306 ; 462 et seq.).

7) In erectis quasi-paroeciis pro matrimoniorum celebratione attendatur oportet canonibus 1096 et 1095 ; in locis vero ubi ipsae constitutae non sunt, Missionarii censendi sunt cooperatores Vicarii vel

Praefecti Apostolici, atque proinde cum licentia generali ab Ordinario concessa valide et licite adstantur matrimoniis.

8) Similiter ex quasi-paroeciae erectione sequitur ut omnes ecclesiae, capellae vel oratoria, intra fines territorii quasi-paroeciae sita, subsidaria habeantur et in eius ditone et dependentia maneant donec quasi-paroecialitatem consequantur vel a quasi-parochi cura exempta fuerint, ad normam can. 464.

9) Optimum demum consilium erit, divisione territorii in quasi-paroecias peracta, dispertiri quoque Vicariatum vel Praefecturam in aliquos districtus qui plures quasi-paroecias comprehendant, prouti iam in aliquibus Vicariatibus laudabiliter factum est, ut ita etiam Vicariatus foranei adumbrentur atque aptius regimini et administrationi missionis provideatur (can. 217, 445 et seq.).

Ex aedibus S. C. Propagandae Fidei, die 25 iulii 1920.

G. M. CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Praefectus*.

C. LAURENTI, *Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

## APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION ERECTING A NEW ABBACY AT CARDIFF

(March 21, 1920)

### CARDIFFENSIS

ERECTIO NOVAE ABBATIAE

BENEDICTUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

Praeclara gesta Benedictini Ordinis ad Ecclesiae gloriam augendam cum aliis Europae regionibus etiam Britannia Insula experta est, in quam sancti Benedicti filii, una cum christiana religione humanum civilemque cultum introduxerunt. Haec monachorum sollicitudo non defuit, quum nobilissima illa natio e sinu Romanae Ecclesiae avulsa fuit, immo in dies crevit, praesertim hac nostra aetate. Eiusdem itaque Ordinis operae et studio non modica ex parte recte ascribendum est, si tot tantaque in Anglia incrementa catholica Fides hisce temporibus assequuta est, ut ibi, plurimis in locis, sacra hierachia denuo constitui visum esset.

Haec Benedictini Ordinis merita prae oculis habentes, Nos Apostolicis Litteris *Cambria Celtica*, die septima mensis februarii, anni millesimi nongentesimi decimi sexti, Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo, datis, episcopali sede Neoportensi in urbem Cardiffensem translata et ad Metropolitanam dignitatem evecta, simulque hoc ipso nova ecclesiastica provincia in Walliae principatu constituta, decrevimus 'ut monasticum capitulum in loco Belmont penes Hereford et episcopalis cathedra ibi erecta in suo statu servarentur. . . adeo ut archiepiscopus Cardiffensis duo haberet capitula, alterum saeculare, alterum regulare, duasque cathedrales ecclesias.'



Dum, vero, Apostolicae Litterae ad executionem demandabantur et de regulis agebatur utrique capitulo statuendis, dilectus filius Cuthbertus Butler, Abbas, Congregationis Anglo-Benedictinae Praeses, una cum aliis Abbatibus ipsius Congregationis, bonum atque utile Ecclesiae se facturum existimavit, si cathedralis privilegio et capituli cathedralis, quod Belmontensi conventui concessum fuerat, renunciaret. Quamobrem, habito tum praedictorum Abbatum, tum Belmontensis Monasterii consensu, litteris die vigesima quarta ianuarii huius anni millesimi nongentesimi vigesimi datis, Nobis declaravit paratum se esse, si Apostolicae Sedi placeret, memoratis privilegiis sese abdicare, illud tamen addens gratum sibi fore, ad dimissae cathedralitatis dignitatis memoriam retinendam, ut Belmontense Monasterium in propriam veramque Benedictini Ordinis Abbatiam erigeretur.

Nos autem, deprehendentes Abbatis memoratae Congregationis Praesidis consilium iustis innixum causis, preces ab eodem exhibitas admittendas decrevimus atque admisimus.

Hisce itaque Apostolicis sub plumbo Litteris, dimissionem praefati privilegii cathedralitatis et capituli, praedictae ecclesiae monasticae et religiosorum domui iam concessi, acceptam habemus, simulque vero Benedictinum Belmontense Monasterium in veram, propriam atque independentem, iuxta preces, Abbatiam erigimus et constituimus, sicut ceterae omnes Anglo-Benedictinae Abbatiae, cum universis iuribus, privilegiis et obligationibus, quae ad eas, iuxta canonicas leges et constitutiones a Sancta Sede adprobatae, ac memorati Ordinis, pertinent, cum familia insuper sui iuris, sub Abbate ab eadem familia ad normam Constitutionum dictae Congregationis eligendo.

Noscentes insuper quae et quanta Benedictinus Ordo, iam a tempore Magni Gregorii, Decessoris Nostri, de Ecclesia et de religione in Anglia sit meritis, simulque recogitantes hodiernam ipsam renunciationem nonnisi hac mente peractam esse, scilicet ad maius Ecclesiae bonum assequendum, declaramus Apostolicam Sedem tot Benedictini Ordinis promeritorum nunquam oblituram, atque in tot beneficiorum, memoriam, quantum humana permittant adiuncta, libenter curaturam, ne unquam desit inter Angliae Praesules unus ex sancti Benedicti alumnis, qui aliquam regendam suscipiat dioecesim, eamque, ut per elapsa tempora, scientia ac virtute illustret.

Praesentes autem Litteras et in eis contenta quaecumque, etiam ex eo quod quilibet quorum interest, vel interesse praesumant, auditi non fuerint, ac praemissis non consenserint, etiam si expressa, specifica et individua mentione digni sint, nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis, vel obreptionis, aut nullitatis vitio seu intentionis Nostrae, vel quolibet alio, licet substantiali et inexcogitato defectu notari, impugnari, vel in controversiam vocari posse, sed eas, tamquam ex certa scientia ac potestatis plenitudine factas et emanatas, perpetuo validas exsistere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, atque ab omnibus ad quos spectat inviolabiliter observari debere, et si secus super his a quocumque, quavis auctoritate, scienter, vel ignoranter contigerit attentari, irritum prorsus et inane esse et fore volumus et decernimus.

Non obstantibus, quatenus opus sit, regulis in synodalibus, provincialibus, generalibus universalibusque conciliis editis, specialibus, vel generalibus Constitutionibus et ordinationibus Apostolicis, et quibusvis aliis Romanorum Pontificum praedecessorum Nostrorum dispositionibus, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Volumus autem ut harum Litterarum transumptis, etiam impressis, manu tamen alicuius notarii publici subscriptis, ac sigillo alicuius in ecclesiastica dignitate constituti munitis, adhibeatur eadem prorsus fides, in iudicio et extra illud, quae eisdem praesentibus litteris adhiberetur, si originaliter forent exhibitae, vel ostensae.

Nemini ergo liceat quae hisce Litteris Nostris statuta sunt infringere vel eis ausu temerario contraire.

Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli, Apostolorum Eius, se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, anno Domini millesimo non-gentesimo vigesimo, die vigesima prima mensis martii, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI,  
*Episcopus Sabinensis,*  
*Secret. S. Congr. Consistorialis.*

P. CARD. GASPARRI,  
*a Secretis Status.*

Loco ✠ Plumbi.

Iulius Campori, *Protonotarius Apostolicus.*

Raphaël Virili, *Protonotarius Apostolicus.*

# LETTER OF BENEDICT XV TO HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL LA FONTAINE AND THE OTHER BISHOPS OF THE PROVINCE OF VENICE

(June 14, 1920)

## EPISTOLAE

AD PETRUM S. R. E. PRESB. CARD. LA FONTAINE, PATRIARCHAM VENETIARUM, ET BARTHOLOMAEUM S. R. E. PRESB. CARD. BACILIERI, EPISCOPUM VERONENSEM, ANTONIUM, ARCHIEPISCOPUM UTINENSEM, CETEROSQUE EPISCOPOS VENETAE REGIONIS: DE PRINCIPIIS CHRISTIANIS IN RE SOCIALI ADHIBENDIS.

Dilecti filii Nostri ac venerabiles fratres, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Intelleximus ex iis litteris, quas dudum communiter ad Nos dedistis, magna vos urgeri sollicitudine ob eos populares motus, quibus istius regionis tranquillitas in praesens conturbatur; non solum quia perdifficiles sunt atque arduae quaestiones de quibus agitur, sed etiam quia ipsa Fides in discrimen adducitur. Istam Nos curam vestram ex animo easdemque ob causas participamus; eo magis quod Nostrorum partium est maxime et christianam animorum reconciliationem revocare et sempiternae populorum saluti prospicere. Primum omnium recte vos propria quaedam in operariorum utilitatem instituistis officia



quae quidem, principiis christianae sapientiae adhibitis, quasvis inter eos qui vel rem conferunt vel operam contentiones dirimerent. Et certe, uti ad Bergomensensem Episcopum haud ita pridem scripsimus, magno usui esse possunt haec officia, dummodo et catholicis principiis nitantur, et in iis quae ad religionem, mores doctrinamque pertinent, potestati Ecclesiae oboedienter subsint.

Namque ad sanationem malorum quae in huiusmodi causis existunt, Ecclesia tantum certam habet medicinae efficacitatem, congruenter aeternis iustitiae legibus, quam hodie humanum genus magna voce undique efflagitare audimus. Atque hae sunt omnino servandae leges, intra tamen proprios ipsarum fines ut iustae stabilesque permanent. Quare cum locupletes hortamur ut largitati studeant et aequitatem potius sequantur quam ius, tum proletarios sedulo commonemus, caveant ne, si quid immoderatus expostulare contendat, sua ipsorum Fides periclitetur. Haec enim insidiosa est adversariorum ratio ut, etiam ab Ecclesia, immodica exigere suadeant; quae ubi multitudo non adepta sit, ipsam ad defectionem concitent. Itaque ab omni agendi intemperantia abstinendum est; quae quidem semper adest cum vel vis adhibetur atque odia inter civium ordines foventur, vel quae sunt in ipsa hominum fraternitate et aequalitate plurimas natura dissimilitudines negliguntur, vel demum in hac fluxarum rerum adeptione omnis humanae vitae finis collocatur. Norunt quidem pauperes et egentes quam peculiari studio Nos eos prosequamur, utpote similitudini Iesu Domini propiores. Sed tamen veremur ne aliquando, dum petunt quod sibi debetur, usque eo perveniant ut, officiis posthabitis, invadant in aliena iura, quae sancta, non aliter ac sua propria, prorsus habenda esse Religio iubet. Docent quidem adversarii alienum ius laedere, iis valde probantibus qui hominis beatitatem in hac mortali vita omnem ponunt; atqui violatum ius in aeternum reclamat.

Quapropter sint dicto Ecclesiae audientes proletarii, quamvis minus ea dare quam adversarii videatur; non enim immodica est fallacia, sed quae iusta sunt ac diuturna promittit: ac meminerint eam, quamquam omnium matrem, ipsos, uti diximus, praecipuo quodam studio complecti; divitesque, si quando defendat, non quia divites, sed quia iniuste vexatos defendere. Item locupletes Ecclesiae obsequantur, materno ipsius amore et aequabilitate confisi.

Vos vero, dilecti filii Nostri et venerabiles fratres, impensam date operam ut pacifice populus suum assequi contendat: cumque in hanc rem catholicae praesertim consociationes conducant, vestrum erit curare modis omnibus quo ipsae cotidie magis ubique vigeant ac floreat. In his lecti de populo homines praecipue adlaborent; iuniores actuosam virtutem afferendo, seniores prudentiam, consilium usumque rerum praestando: clerus autem nec agitationes nec multo minus seditiones particeps, sed potius, optima quaeque verbis et exemplo suadens, concitatos animos opportune tranquillet. Has igitur consociationes Nos cum operariorum tum dominorum benevolentiae magnopere commendamus; ac fore confidimus ut plurimum ipsae, Deo favente, ad commune bonum conferant, maxime si numquam ab ecclesiasticae Auctoritatis obsequio

discedant nec a lege christianae charitatis. Caelestium autem munerum auspicem ac paternae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis, dilecti filii Nostri et venerabiles fratres, cunctoque clero ac populo vigilantiae vestrae credito, apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, die XIV mensis iunii MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

**CIRCULAR LETTER OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL TO THE ORDINARIES OF ITALY**

(May 31, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

LETTERA CIRCOLARE AI REVERENDISSIMI ORDINARI D'ITALIA

Revmo Signore,

Se in ogni tempo è necessaria l'istruzione religiosa del popolo cristiano, lo è maggiormente in questi tempi calamitosi, in cui si tenta con tutti i mezzi, de sovvertire dalla stessa base l'ordine religioso e sociale. Ed il nuovo Codice di diritto canonico nei capitoli *de catechetica institutione* (can. 1329-1336) e *de sacris concionibus* (can. 1344-1348) prescrive norme tassative per l'insegnamento della Dottrina Cristiana ai fanciulli e agli adulti e per la spiegazione del Vangelo al popolo.

Niun dubbio che i Revmi Ordinari d'Italia, nel loro zelo illuminato, avranno inculcato ai parroci e agli altri aventi cura d'anime—nel modo che la prudenza e la sollecitudine per il gregge loro affidato dettava—l'esatta osservanza delle sapienti disposizioni stabilite dal diritto canonico.

Nell'intento però di dare un maggior impulso all'istruzione religiosa e di coadiuvare l'azione dei Revmi Ordinari in una causa di così capitale importanza, questa Sacra Congregazione, con la piena approvazione del Santo Padre, invita li Revmi Ordinari d'Italia a rispondere, secondo scienza e coscienza e nel più breve tempo possibile, ai seguenti quesiti:

I. Se e quali provvedimenti siano stati presi per l'esecuzione delle suindicate disposizioni relative alla spiegazione del Vangelo e all'insegnamento del Catechismo.

II. Se dal Vescovo siano state sancite pene speciali contro i trasgressori.

III. Se tutti i singoli parroci della diocesi ed altri aventi cura d'anime:

a) spieghino il Vangelo al popolo in tutte le domeniche ed altre feste di precetto.

b) nei predetti giorni spieghino agli adulti la Dottrina Cristiana, e se, e per quali motivi, siasi introdotta la consuetudine di qualche vacanza.

IV. Se i parroci e gli altri aventi cura d'anime insegnino per sè o per mezzo di altri il Catechismo ai fanciulli ed

a) in qual tempo e in qual modo lo insegnino;

b) se preparino e in qual modo e in qual tempo i fanciulli alla confessione, alla cresima e alla prima comunione;



c) se in ogni parrocchia siano state erette le Confraternite della Dottrina Cristiana;

d) se e quale altro mezzo sia stato usato per l'insegnamento del Catechismo a coloro, che non ebbero tale istruzione.

V. S'indichino i nomi di quei parroci e curatori d'anime che non soddisfacessero ai doveri notati sotto i numeri III e IV.

VI. Quali i provvedimenti presi dall'autorità diocesana contro i trasgressori.

VII. Se per questi trasgressori, oltre l'azione dell'Ordinario, si richiedesse l'intervento di questa S. C.

VIII. Se il clero secolare e regolare si presti all'insegnamento del Catechismo in parrocchia ed in caso negativo per quali motivi. Se ne indichino le persone e gli istituti religiosi.

IX. S'indichino le altre misure che si potrebbero prendere dalla Santa Sede, perchè le disposizioni canoniche riguardanti l'insegnamento del Catechismo e la spiegazione del Vangelo vengano efficacemente poste in esecuzione

Roma, dalla Segreteria della S. C. del Concilio, 31 maggio 1920.

D. CARD. SBARRETTI, *Prefetto*.

G. MORI, *Segretario*.

# REVIEWS AND NOTES

LETTERS AND PAPERS HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED OF THE FATHERS  
LACORDAIRE, JANDEL, DANZAS. Edited by Father Raymund  
Devas, O.P., Hawkesyard, Rugeley, Staffs.

THESE papers deal with the history of the restoration of the Dominican Order in France and of the establishment of the Province of Lyons, in the first half of the nineteenth century. The persons who figured most prominently in the history were Fathers Lacordaire, Jandel, and Danzas. There had been a good deal of misunderstanding with regard to their behaviour in the disagreeable controversy that went on between these men. They have been shown in a false light. It is a matter of much importance that the truth should be revealed. Father Devas has come to know the facts. He has gone to a great deal of trouble in searching different archives of the Order and in unearthing the original sources of information. He is more concerned in his translation with accuracy than with style. Yet, the work scarcely bears any sign of its being a translation. There are some minor faults which in no way take away from the merit of the whole.

The greater part of the book is taken up with the unfinished Memoir of the General of the Dominicans, Father Jandel. The sole object of this Memoir was the preservation of the record of truth which would otherwise have been buried with him in the grave. Father Jandel tells us that he has not set himself to this work in the interests of his own defence, and is not concerned with the pitiful question of personalities, but with burning questions of a much higher order. He is concerned with a question of principle, the preservation of the Dominican Order in its primitive observance. He wishes to make known the gravity of the motives which made him determined to face so many difficulties and undergo so much strife in order to insure the success of his work.

The whole story is a sad one for the most part. The point of the dispute may seem, indeed, very insignificant, but for these great men nothing seemed to be trivial or unimportant in the service of God. The great common work of these men was the restoration of the Dominican Order in France. Father Lacordaire desired in his impetuous ardour to make the Dominican habit appear once more in the pulpit of Notre Dame. The disposition to live from day to day and to let himself be guided by events he did not confine merely to the means of working for the Dominican re-establishment in France ; he extended it also to the foundations themselves on which he was to work. At this time Father Jandel and Father Lacordaire were struck with the state of decadence to which they



saw the Order reduced in Italy. They desired to save themselves in France from a like evil and to adhere firmly and for ever to the spirit and the laws of the Order, to make a clean slate of all the pretended customs which in these latter days had disfigured it. This they considered comparatively easy in a new and absolutely free territory in France. This was all very well, but, when Father Jandel was appointed General and Father Lacordaire First Provincial, the difficulties began in putting their high ideas into practice. Differences of opinion arose between the two great men with regard to the Night-Office. Father Jandel was for the primitive observance, rising at 4 a.m., for the recitation; whilst Father Lacordaire ordered it for 10 p.m. This was the origin of all the dissensions, disputes, and troubles that the restoration of the Order met with in its infancy in France. It is the origin of the papers and letters contained in the volume, which reveal a piece of interesting history, apart altogether from the mere subject matter of the dispute.

One thing we are thankful for in these discoveries is the new light thrown on the character of Father Lacordaire. Even his great adversary in the dispute, Father Jandel, had nothing harsh to say of him. He bears willing testimony to the purity of his motives and the rectitude of his intentions. Father Lacordaire's weakness was in submitting to the influence of the people in whom he trusted and whose advice he deemed disinterested. If he elected to mitigate the severity of the observance, it was not from want of courage or from fear of mortification, for towards himself he was severe; and indeed no one more than he attached greater importance to the practice of bodily penances, for which he had a distinct attraction. Father Jandel even clears Lacordaire of the charge of unsound, or at least rash, opinions on the coercive power of the Church, on the origin of sovereignty, and on the temporal power of the Pope. In the whole dispute we see inspiring examples of generosity, forbearance, self-sacrifice, and charity, which do credit to these great reformers. It is well to clear their names. And Father Devas has done a useful work and written a most interesting narrative of an important epoch in the history of the Dominican Order.

M. R.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF GRACE. By G. H. Joyce, S.J. London: Burns and Oates and R. & T. Washbourne.

THERE has never, perhaps, been a time when the Catholic religion was more discussed than at the present time. Men see that it alone has held its ground, unshaken by the tremendous religious disintegration of the nineteenth century; that the crisis which seemed to threaten all belief in religion has, contrary to all expectation, left it stronger than it was before. This fact has made it an object of deeper interest, alike to the unbeliever and to the earnest seeker after truth. It is only natural that in the circumstances Catholics should desire to possess a clear knowledge of what the Church teaches. Yet, for the laity such knowledge is not easily accessible on the big questions. Works on theology are drawn up

in a highly technical manner. It is for this large body of readers that the present work has been written. The Church's teaching on Grace is set forth, avoiding as far as possible the technical terminology. The authority of St. Thomas Aquinas has been closely followed throughout. The author has made no attempt to deal with the problem respecting the operation of efficacious Grace, which for so long was the subject of such acute controversy between the Dominican and Jesuit Orders. He considers that it belongs more appropriately to the treatise on God and His attributes. At any rate, he considers that the problem is primarily a metaphysical one, and considering the class of readers for which the book is intended, that the book does not suffer from the omission.

Apart from this omission the whole subject of Grace is treated in all its aspects, its nature, its growth, its effects. It is treated from a strictly theological standpoint and follows as closely as possible the theological method. Not that we have a series of propositions, syllogisms, proofs, objections and answers, etc., but yet all these are skilfully woven into a treatise that asserts and explains, without appearing to argue. The Scriptures and the Fathers are skilfully handled also, and introduced in an easy natural manner that makes the exposition run smoothly and consistently. The author casts his vision outside the mere traditional method of treating Grace and brings his treatise up-to-date and in touch with modern phases of religion bearing on the question. He does well to emphasise these points, for they are matters on which there is a good deal of loose thinking and talking, and about which much controversy turns at the present day. Especially is this the case in the chapters on the *Home of Grace* where he deals at great length with the dictum *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, and explains it separately, as regards Protestants, Mahommedans, Jews, and Pagans. Very telling likewise is his exposition of the consequences to modern Protestantism of the doctrines of Calvin and Luther on Justification. In this he strikes a severe blow at the very existence of Christianity in the Protestant Church.

We consider Father Joyce has written a monumental work, that will be of the greatest help to theologians and others. For lucidity and conciseness it could scarcely be equalled. In its 267 pages there is scarcely a superfluous word. It will be of enormous value to preachers in their Catechetical instructions, providing a wealth of material in a style that might well be imitated by them.

M. R.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Père Suau, S.J. London: Burns & Oates, and R. & T. Washbourne (From the French of the Second Edition).

WE have yet another book on Catholic Doctrine. But it is built up on lines of its own. It is a short and simple exposition. Its scope is to draw the Catholic Doctrine from its source, the teaching of Jesus, and then to set down clearly what Our Lord has directed us to believe and to do. The author's desire is to show that there is no Christian Faith except the Catholic Faith, and this precisely is the Faith which our Lord preached. He simply states what he taught and laid down. He does not



argue but explains, being convinced that many controversies spring from a misunderstanding which they do but serve to prolong. They end, as soon as people understand one another, and that is the very point from which they ought to have started. The author then endeavours to clear the ground, to lay the foundation securely so as to build the structure which nothing can shake. The building will look after itself when the foundations are laid properly, and the winds of controversy will not affect it when agreement has been secured in fundamentals. Hence the book is not controversial. It tells clearly and frankly what the Catholic principles are, what they teach, and why.

It is an excellent little book for this purpose, and is a very useful book to put into the hands of intending converts, or others desirous of acquiring a concise and complete idea of the Church.

M. R.

GREAT FRENCH SERMONS FROM BOSSUET, BOURDALOUE AND MASSILLON  
(Second Series). Edited by <sup>3</sup> Rev. D. O'Mahony, B.D., B.C.L.  
London: Sands & Co.

THE favourable reception accorded to the First Series has led to the publication of this Second Series, which is most probably the first appearance in English of these Sermons. The subject matter alone has been the guide in the selection of the discourses, some of which have been curtailed in unimportant parts. In all there are twenty-one discourses. Special attention is drawn to that under the title 'Uplifting of the soul,' by Bossuet, to which are appended some sections of his singularly beautiful *Elevations sur les Mystères*, than which, according to the French non-Catholic historian, Henri Martin, there is nothing more elevated among the monuments of the Christian mind. Anyone who has not read the *Elevations* does not really know Bossuet.

We have here three types of preachers. As a writer, and so far as eloquence and language are concerned, Bossuet has always been considered as one of the first that his country has produced. He is the greatest orator that has ever appeared in the Christian Pulpit—greater than Chrysostom and greater than Augustine; the only man whose name can be compared in eloquence with those of Cicero and Demosthenes. He has a clear and complete comprehension of the world, of moral, political, civil, and religious doctrines. He sees in the Bible living science, palpitating and flaming speech, he shrouds himself in it and becomes imbued with it. 'Demosthenes and Cicero,' says Henri Martin, 'were equalled by Bossuet, equalled as to genius, surpassed as to sublimity of tone and subject.'

Bourdaloue and Massillon are very far behind him. But that only emphasises the lofty position of Bossuet. It does not take away from their greatness in their own sphere and style. In his own 'species of eloquence, Bourdaloue has attained, perhaps, the highest perfection of which the French language is capable,' says Fenelon. 'He was one of the first to make reason speak in the pulpit, and always eloquently,' wrote

Voltaire. He convinces rather than commands. Logic, reason, wisdom and piety dwelt in the soul of Bourdaloue, and flowed copiously from his lips. He is a master of statement, he does not dazzle or startle, he does what is better, he nourishes.

Amongst the great French preachers, Massillon reigns supreme in the possession of the quality of unction, that sweet, pious, and affectionate effusion of heart, that is full of God, which makes its way, without violence or uproar, into the soul of the hearer. He is pathetic and persuasive.

Here then we have these three master minds and orators, each supreme in his own style. Those who wish to hear their message delivered in excellent English, that conveys the spirit of the original, would do well to get these series. The form may not exactly suit modern methods of preaching, but we can with profit dig from their precious mine and possess riches of thought and matter. We can imbibe some of their unction and genius. We have models to be thankful for, and, we owe Father O'Mahony much for furnishing us with some of the most sublime utterances that have fallen from the lips of preachers. The book is well printed and neatly brought out.

M. R.

### BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

- America* : A Catholic Review (August).  
*The Ecclesiastical Review* (August). U.S.A.  
*The Rosary Magazine* (August). Somerset, Ohio.  
*The Catholic World* (August). New York.  
*The Austral Light* (July). Melbourne.  
*The Ave Maria* (July). Notre Dame, Indiana.  
*The Irish Monthly* (August). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Catholic Bulletin* (August). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Month* (August). London : Longmans.  
*Études* (August). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII<sup>e</sup>).  
*Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* (August). Paris : Beauchesne.  
*Revue du Clergé Français* (August). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.  
*The Fortnightly Review* (August). St. Louis, Mo.  
*The Lamp* (August). Garrison, N.Y.  
*Revue des Jeunes* (August). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.  
*Twenty Cures at Lourdes*. By Dr. De Grandmaister. London : Sands & Co.  
*Dublin Review* (July-September). London : Burns & Oates.  
*Great French Sermons*. Edited by Rev. D. O'Mahony. London : Sands & Co.  
*The Catholic Doctrine of Grace*. By G. H. Joyce, S.J. London : Burns & Oates and R. & T. Washbourne.



# BLESSED OLIVER PLUNKETT

BY REV. MYLES V. RONAN

## I—PLUNKETT, THE PRIEST

BORN in Loughcrew, near Oldcastle in the Co. Meath, in 1629, Oliver Plunkett belonged to the noble family of Plunkett, which included the Catholic Earls of Fingall, Barons Louth and Dunsany, and Dr. Patrick Plunkett, Bishop of Meath. He was kinsman also to the Earl of Roscommon. Being deprived of both parents in early life, his education was undertaken by his relatives. Providence, however, bestowed on him in early life a great friend, who became likewise a father to him. Father Scarampi, the learned Oratorian, had been sent by Pope Urban VIII on a mission to the Confederation of Kilkenny in 1643. Before his return to Rome, in 1645, five youths were introduced to him, as they had expressed a desire for the priesthood. One of these was Oliver Plunkett. Father Scarampi shielded his little flock from many dangers on their perilous journey, and later introduced Oliver to the Irish College, where he paid his fees for him until a free place should be vacant. One of Oliver's fellow-travellers was young Brennan, who afterwards became the first Bishop of Waterford and Lismore and Oliver's life-long companion and helper. His strong and warm attachment to his friends became a remarkable trait in his character. According to the testimony of his Rector 'he was justly ranked amongst the foremost in talent, diligence and progress in his studies. . . . Everywhere and at all times he was a model of gentleness, integrity and piety.' After a brilliant course of eight years he was ordained in 1654.

After his ordination he longed to return to the work of the mission in Ireland, the work for which he was ordained. But there were perils on land and on sea. There was little use in returning to his native land if he were not allowed to do priest's work for his people. Consequently he addressed a letter, which is still preserved in the archives of the Irish

College, Rome, to the General of the Jesuits, who was at that time Rector of the College, asking to be allowed to remain in Rome and to dwell with the Fathers of San Girolamo della Carità, and promising to return to Ireland whenever his superiors should command.

Besides attending lectures at the Roman University, commonly known as the *Sapienza*, for his doctorate in Canon and Civil Law, he shared in the works of charity which had made the priests who lived at San Girolamo known as men of remarkable zeal. This church, dedicated to St. Jerome, on the site of the house in which he lived when he came to Rome to revise the Bible, was frequented by prelates and nobles of the Papal Court in the fifteenth century to satisfy their devotions. They held meetings in a house close by, and, on the advice of Cardinal Giulio dei Medici, formed themselves into a brotherhood of charity in 1519. When the Cardinal became Clement VII, he gave them charge of the church of San Girolamo. They were, what we call now, a Vincent de Paul Society. But, besides visiting and helping the needy, they looked after two prisons, assisted the prisoners in their sickness, and helped them, when set free, to lead an honest life. They maintained homes for penitents, and gave dowries to poor, respectable girls. They visited the sick in the hospitals, especially those in the great hospital of Santo Spirito, and saw to the wants of their families. Thus the Institution came to be known as San Girolamo della Carità. It had no rules or constitution, charity was the only bond of union. To this house belonged the Venerable Cacciaquerra and his biographer, Marangoni, who, in his *Life*, wrote some interesting particulars of Oliver Plunkett. But most remarkable of all the members was Philip Neri, who came to reside there in 1551. Philip Neri and his companions soon discovered the necessity of looking after patients when discharged from hospital, and set up a convalescent home in connexion with the Confraternity of San Girolamo.

This was the atmosphere of holiness, charity, and zeal which Oliver Plunkett breathed for fifteen years after he had left the Irish College. He was introduced to it by his old friend Father Scarampi. It is scarcely necessary to say that he followed in the footsteps of Philip Neri, and that he lived a life remarkable amongst the remarkable men who passed their lives there. For particulars in this respect, in the social work of Oliver Plunkett in Rome,



which has hitherto not received its due attention, we are deeply indebted to the zealous research of the late gifted Monsignor O'Riordan, Rector of the Irish College, Rome.<sup>1</sup> Marangoni in his *Life of Venerable Cacciaquerra* says that

Dr. Plunkett should be ranked amongst the most illustrious personages whose virtuous lives adorned the Institute of San Girolamo della Carità. The zeal which consumed his heart for the salvation of souls is beyond belief. He devoted himself to works of piety within and without the house. He paid frequent visits to the sanctuaries bathed in the blood of so many martyrs, and he longed to sacrifice himself for the salvation of his countrymen. He frequently visited the hospital of Santo Spirito, where his devotion to the sick in the lowliest works and ways was a wonder and an edification to the physicians and other officials of the place.

Such a testimony, coming from one not of his country, brings out into bolder relief the reputation that Oliver Plunkett had earned for himself in this field of Christian charity in Rome. This wonderful charity, begotten of deep faith, was a striking thing in the midst of the paganizing influences around them. It united those princes and theologians in the closest friendship which years could not diminish or seas obliterate. They breathed the spirit of Philip Neri, who had impressed the institution of San Girolamo with his own character, and given it a tradition. His spiritual ideal was the sanctification of self through a life spent for others. Charity entirely ruled the work that was done there. The active and ardent temperament of Oliver Plunkett easily fitted into the ways and works of such an Institution, and, as we have seen, he was soon well known at the hospitals and at the prisons where he ministered. It was a fitting preparation for his life of self-sacrifice in his own land.

Such was the personality of Dr. Plunkett that it procured him friends among the great as well as among the lowly. Princes and prelates, Popes and Cardinals, valued his friendship and appreciated his qualities of mind as well as of heart. Several letters of Dr. Plunkett's are extant, in which his goodness of heart is revealed. They were written when he was Primate of Armagh to his old friends in Rome. When Monsignor Odescalchi became Pope Innocent XI, Dr. Plunkett wrote a letter to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda to express his joy. The Pope's brother, Prince Odescalchi, was one of the Confraternity of San Girolamo della Carità. In his letter the Primate

<sup>1</sup> *Catholic Bulletin*, March, 1920.

recalls the charity of the Prince, and in doing so he gives us, by accident, a view of his own :—

Whilst I was Professor of Theology and Controversy at Propaganda, for many years I had an opportunity of witnessing the holiness of the new Pope, and the great esteem in which his prudence and wisdom were held by all. I was particularly intimate with Don Marcantonio Odescalchi. I often assisted him when he served the poor and ragged and needy, many of them covered with vermin. He gathered them into an asylum and clothed them at his own expense. He washed them with his own hands, fed them, etc. I am sure that God gave to the Church so holy a Head mostly through the merit of the saintly Don Marcantonio.

This letter was written on August 11, 1677, less than four years before his martyrdom.

Two other letters of Dr. Plunkett show that he had not forgotten his benefactors in Rome. He was not one who forgot a kindness. The sadness that overcast his young life (some of his relatives were dead, others had been sent into exile) remained with him in manhood, and his heart went out, with all its warmth and ardour, to those who befriended him. Monsignor Cerri was his fellow-student at the Roman College. He belonged to a family of influence and importance in Rome. Through him Cardinal Barberini, who was Cardinal Protector of Ireland, had Dr. Plunkett appointed to the Chair of Theology in the Propaganda. When Plunkett had been some years Archbishop of Armagh, hearing of the death of Monsignor Cerri's father, he wrote :—

A little while before his death, Father Scarampi wrote to your father recommending me to his protection. Through his influence I soon afterwards obtained the Chair of Theology and subsequently that of Controversy at Propaganda, where I continued to teach till I was appointed to the primatial See of this kingdom, about nine years ago. I, in these remote quarters of the Christian world, make continual remembrance of Don Tommaso in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass ; I pray for the prosperity of the whole house of Cerri, and I get other priests to do likewise.

Again, when he had heard of the death of Monsignor Cerri, the memory of past kindness made him write :—

I am extremely sorry for the death of Mgr. Cerri. He was my fellow-student in Rome ; his father, Don Francesco, was a very dear friend of mine. I shall have the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered up for him and prayers said for him by the priests of this province of Armagh. They are under an obligation to him for all he did for them when he was Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda.

Plunkett was ever ready to acknowledge his indebtedness, and to show his gratitude and his remembrance of the debt.



It was to Father Scarampi, who had brought him from Ireland and who had secured a place for him in San Girolamo, that Dr. Plunkett owed a further favour. When stricken with the plague whilst attending the hospital of St. Bartholomew, Scarampi wrote on his death-bed to his brother recommending Plunkett to his care. He loved Plunkett and Plunkett loved and venerated him. It was through the influence of Father Scarampi's brother and of the Cerri family that Plunkett was appointed professor at the Propaganda. This was a work of love for Plunkett. The Propaganda had mothered the Irish Church during the days of persecution. Many of Ireland's sons had been educated at its college when they were deprived of that education at home. Many of his countrymen were at the time in the Propaganda. He devoted all his talents to the task he undertook. He filled the Chair of Theology and of Controversy for twelve years, from 1657 to 1669. The School of Controversy held at that time a place in the course of Theology similar to that which the School of Apologetics holds to-day. It had to defend the principle of Authority in religion against the supposed divine right of private judgment, together with those particular doctrines that Protestantism had assailed. The principles and the doctrines of the Catholic Church had to be explained and defended against the new heresy that had arisen in the sixteenth century. That was the scope of Dr. Plunkett's duties for twelve years. But, more than this, he raised the standard and extended the course of studies at the Propaganda. He was likewise busy preparing works, probably of religious controversy, for the press. But no trace can be found of them either in manuscript or book form. The Pope appointed him Consultor of the Congregation of the Index, at that time a useful instrument for guarding faith and discipline, and a necessary one in those times of religious rebellion and theological strife. This appointment was a token of confidence shown by the Pope in Plunkett's theological acquirements and orthodoxy. We may be sure that he devoted himself to the work with the same zeal as he showed in his works of charity and in his professional duties. Monsignor O'Riordan says: 'It is possible that some of the dissertations which he wrote as Consultor when submitting his *Votum* are still preserved in the archives of that Congregation.' <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Catholic Bulletin*, May, 1920.

## II—PLUNKETT, THE PRIMATE

Oliver Plunkett, in a petition which he presented to the Propaganda whilst he was yet Roman agent of the Irish Bishops, said that there were 2,000,000 Catholics in Ireland, 1,000 secular priests, and 600 members of religious Orders. But they were constantly in the presence of the danger of imprisonment, exile, or death. The Penal Law was on the Statute Book. Peace or persecution depended on the Viceroy. Of the priests and bishops who were left in Ireland, hardly any had a fixed residence which he could call his home :—

Bishop French, of Ferns [says Mgr. O'Riordan<sup>1</sup>], had been living in Ghent for 20 years—ever since the departure of Rinuccini, and he dared not go back so long as Ormond had power or influence to keep him out. In 1668 the only Bishops in Ireland were Dr. McSwiney, Bishop of Dromore, whom old age and many trials had made weak in mind as well as in body, and Dr. Plunkett, Bishop of Meath, whom family influence had left free to administer his diocese, as long as he did it on the quiet. He was the only Bishop in Ireland, in 1668, and for a few years before, who was able to perform episcopal functions.

The convents of religious were in ruins or turned over to profane uses, and the religious had to live here and there, apart and in private houses, or in communities of two or or three, in little temporary dwellings. Again, quoting from Monsignor O'Riordan's article,

On the 21st January, 1669, the Sees of Dublin, Cashel, Tuam and Ossory were provided for. In the following March Edmond O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh, died in Paris, after years of exile from his diocese. The Holy See, on the advice of the Bishops, did not wish to fill any other vacant sees without some special need. It might do more harm than good. The appointment of many might, in fact, leave the country with fewer than there were, or none at all ; for bigotry would call the attention of the civil authorities to the audacious Roman intrusion, and the Bishops would be searched for and banished. Peter Talbot, the newly-appointed Archbishop of Dublin, writing to Propaganda two months after the death of the Archbishop of Armagh, pointed out to the Holy See the need of appointing a successor to him without delay ; for the Protestants were numerous in the North, and the strings of Catholic discipline had been loosened during the exile of the late Primate and his predecessor. It is urgent 'although it is not expedient for the present to make any new Bishop, lest Ormond should say that the Papal authority had received a sudden and dangerous increase in Ireland since his withdrawal.'

<sup>1</sup> *Catholic Bulletin*, August, 1920.



Several names were remanded to the Holy See, and their merits were discussed. At length the Pope said : ' There is no reason why we should spend our time dealing with uncertainties, whilst we have a certainty before our eyes. There is Oliver Plunkett, a man of approved virtue, of consummate learning, of long Roman experience, with all the qualities needed for the vacant Primacy ; I therefore name him Archbishop of Armagh.' He was appointed on the 9th July, 1669. His name does not appear amongst those recommended from Ireland ; but when his appointment became known letters of rejoicing were sent to Rome from many quarters. From Ghent wrote the exiled Bishop of Ferns, from Paris wrote Dr. Dooley, the new Vicar-Apostolic of Limerick, on his way to his diocese ; from Paris also wrote Dr. O'Mahony, Professor at St. Sulpice, soon after made Bishop of Killaloe. And the Archbishop of Dublin wrote to the Secretary of Propaganda :—

' Most agreeable to me were the Roman letters by which I learned of the presentation of the Most Illustrious and learned Oliver Plunkett to the See of Armagh.... Certainly no one could be appointed better fitted than he is. I myself would have proposed him in the first place, but that he had written to me expressing his desire not to enter for some years on the Irish Mission until he had completed some works which he was preparing for the press.'

Having been consecrated by the Bishop of Gand, in his private chapel, on the first Sunday in Advent, 1669, Dr. Plunkett set out for Ireland. He wrote to the Propaganda the day after his consecration, ' I am thinking of passing for an Italian who goes from curiosity to see London. I have found an Englishman who will send my Bulls and Letters to London. My articles of devotion I will leave with the Bishop of Ferns, until a ship is sailing direct to Dublin.' He did not find his way to London as easy as he expected. He remained in London to do some work, to prevent a proposed penal enactment. To influence the Court was to influence Parliament. He had a letter from Cardinal Barberini, the Cardinal Protector of Ireland, to the Queen. He had ' a very favourable audience.' In a letter that he wrote to the Cardinal to tell him of his audience he says that he was ' secretly lodged ' by Father Howard, the Queen's Almoner, ' for ten days in his private apartments in the royal palace.' In ' bitter cold, strong wind, and a heavy fall of snow,' he arrived in Dublin. His enemies were on the look-out and were aware of his landing, for the King wrote to the Viceroy, ' If you can dexterously find them (Plunkett and Agretti) out and apprehend them it will be an acceptable service.' Plunkett knew of the danger, and having remained three days in the house of Sir Nicholas Plunkett, by whom he was brought up in

boyhood, he went directly to his diocese. He wrote to the Secretary of Propaganda :—

I had hardly arrived in Dublin when the Valesians told the Council of State, in order that the Viceroy, apprised of my presence, might have me imprisoned and sent out of the country. But as the Earl of Roscommon is in Dublin, who is a relative of mine, and to whom I showed some kindness when he was in Rome, he set the Viceroy at rest about me, pledging his honour in my favour.

From March, 1670, when Dr. Plunkett took possession of his see in Armagh, until his death we are able to follow the vicissitudes of his life through his letters to the Cardinal Protector of Ireland in Rome, or to the Inter-nuncio in Brussels. There must be many of these letters in various archives in Rome. It is to be sincerely hoped that some one will continue the splendid research work begun by Monsignor O'Riordan and bring these documents to light. It is very fortunate that Oliver Plunkett was such an indefatigable letter writer. But it was his filial devotion to the Chair of Peter that prompted those letters. He tells of his labours and difficulties in his episcopal work, his wearisome journeys, his poverty, the suspicions, opposition, and persecution he had to encounter. In all these we see him the true servant of his Master, self-sacrificing, with no thought of self, and full of courage. His activity and zeal seem to have known no bounds. Within a month and a half of his arrival in Ireland he confirmed 10,000 persons. He held two Synods in his own diocese within two months, and presided over a general Synod of the Irish Bishops in Dublin in June, 1670. Other provincial Councils and Synods soon followed; all for the correction of abuses and the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline. Witness, too, his zeal for education and his establishment of houses and schools, at his own expense, in the various dioceses of Ulster. And yet he himself slept many a night beneath the stars, 'refreshed,' as he terms it, by the rains that fell on him.

Hunted from place to place, he spent the next nine years of his primacy seeking hiding in woods and mountains, adopting various names and disguises. Yet, in spite of edicts and rewards, he writes, 'I will remain in the kingdom, though retired in some country place. . . . I am morally certain that I shall be taken, so many are in search of me, yet, in spite of danger, I will remain with my flock, nor will I abandon them till they drag me to a ship.' These



are indeed the words of the good shepherd who lays down his life for his sheep. It was the very spirit of self-sacrifice he had breathed at San Girolamo. It was after a mission of charity, on visiting his relative, the aged Bishop of Meath, who was dying, that Dr. Plunkett was taken prisoner in Dublin on the 6th of December, 1679.

We are all acquainted with the trumped-up accusations brought against him, imaginary and malicious to the last degree—‘that he had enrolled 70,000 men to unite with the French on their arrival; that he exacted money from the clergy to introduce the French, and pay the army; that he had visited all Ireland, and examined and explored all the seaport towns and fortresses of the kingdom, in order to introduce the French by a sure port, etc.’ We know, too, to our shame, of the despicable, perjured informers who were brought as witnesses against him, the ex-friars MacMoyer, Codd, and Gormley; the transference of the trial to London, and the deliberate delay caused to Dr. Plunkett’s witnesses, who at great sacrifice and expense wished to travel. Left without witnesses or documents, and tried by judges who knew nothing of his saintly life and works, he showed that the charges of conspiracy and treason were utterly groundless. But he emphasized his fulfilment of the episcopal office: ‘I will not deny that as long as there was any toleration I did exercise the functions of a Bishop, but that, by the Second of Elizabeth, is only *praemunire* and no treason.’ And then the great Christian soul shows itself:—

I had rather die ten thousand deaths than wrongfully accuse anybody, and the time will come when your lordship will see what these witnesses are that have come in against me. I do assure your lordship that if I were a man that had no good principles I might easily have saved my life, but I had rather die ten thousand deaths than wrongfully to take away one farthing of any man’s goods, one day of his liberty, or one minute of his life.

All the Lord Chief Justice could say in reply was: ‘I am sorry to see you persist in the principles of that religion.’ Yes, that was the whole front of the offence. He was an Irish Bishop, who carried out the functions of his office.

Dr. Plunkett listened with complete happiness and resignation to the death sentence: ‘God gave me,’ he wrote to Father Corker, his fellow-prisoner and confessor, ‘though unworthy of it, that grace to have *fortem animum*.

*mortis terrore carentem.*' His calmness and strength did not desert him when drawn on a hurdle through the streets of London to Tyburn. The nobility of his bearing and his Christian constancy made a profound impression on Protestants and Catholics alike who crowded round the scaffold. The piety and nobility of his discourse, before the cart was drawn away, affected the spectators, so that they proclaimed with one accord his innocence, and that 'did he live for one hundred years yet never could he have gained such glory for himself, for God, for his country and for the Catholic faith' (Father Arsdekin).

These are but a few features in the life of this saintly, courageous, charitable, and Christ-like priest and prelate. They have been put together to place on record in these pages an appreciation of them on the occasion of his happy Beatification by His Holiness Benedict XV. Our indebtedness for the material is to Cardinal Moran and to Monsignor O'Riordan. It is a matter of deep regret that the latter was not spared to finish his scholarly life of our Beatus. We owe him a deep debt of gratitude for his untiring research. We must also refer to his painstaking efforts to acquire one of the oldest pictures of Dr. Plunkett. We shall let him describe the matter in his own words:—

At the end of the corridor (at San Girolamo), on the left, is a token of the impression which Oliver Plunkett had made on the Prelates and Princes who were the Deputies of San Girolamo della Carità during his residence there. After his martyrdom they had a portrait of him painted, and hung up on the wall of the corridor I have described. It hung there for nearly two centuries and a half as a witness to the esteem which his virtues had won. Under the portrait is the following inscription: "Father Oliver Plunkett, priest of the Oratory, named by Clement IX Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, who for having enforced ecclesiastical discipline was falsely accused before the King by renegades to their faith, and was hanged, drawn, and quartered, at London, honoured by this House of San Girolamo della Carità by his glorious death July 1st, 1681." This original painting is no longer to be seen in that corridor: but a recent copy takes its place to preserve the continuity of the memorial. A few years ago, through the kindness of the present Deputies of San Girolamo della Carità, I got possession of the original painting, which is now beside me in the room where I am writing. As a work of art it is not of very special value, but as a memorial I hold it as sacred, and beyond price. . . . I think it right to record my thanks to Archbishop Lazzareschi, (R.I.P.), Prince Antici Mattei (R.I.P.), His Excellency Prince Aldobrandini and Monsignor Talamo. To their influence chiefly I owe the privilege of possessing the painting.

It is pathetic to read these last words from the Monsignor's



pen. He did not long enjoy the privilege of the picture. He knows the reality now. He had striven hard to know the Primate better. He had searched all over the Eternal City for the marks of his footsteps, for the records of his words. It was a labour of love and a patriotic duty. The Beatus and the Biographer know each other better now in the companionship of Ireland's saints and scholars. May their lives and works be to us an inspiring ideal in the cause of God and country! May they make our efforts generous, noble, and Christ-like in the same sacred cause.

MYLES V. RONAN.

# RECENT IMPRESSIONS OF PORTUGAL

BY REV. M. H. MACINERNY, O.P.

## II

I HAVE good reason to remember the first day I spent in Portugal, about the end of August last year. I was one of a group of travellers—breakfastless, sleepy, and unwashed—who reached the Portuguese frontier station of Villar Formoso some time after midday, only to find that our train was late by nearly an hour and a half, and that we had missed the only connexion available that day. We realized, to our horror, that we had to remain twenty-three hours in Villar Formoso, a primitive hamlet, set in a wilderness of stones and sand. Two of us paid a visit to the local priest, in order to secure his services for a passenger who seemed dangerously ill. One of the finest acts of Christian charity I have ever witnessed was the unremitting kindness bestowed on that poor passenger by a Portuguese soldier and a French seamstress, despite the fact that the sick man's malady rendered him a nauseating and repulsive object.

The parish priest proved to be a most kindly and hospitable man, with whom we had a long and interesting conversation. The Revolution, he said, had not affected the lives of his people very deeply. Most of them still went to Mass, and were tolerably good Christians otherwise. The people—at least, those among them who were real Catholics—had shaken off the human respect which had enthralled them in days gone by. But there was a lamentable shortage of priests: in some regions, two or three parishes had to be served by a single pastor. Some of the clergy went to Salamanca for their annual retreats. Bishops were more active than it was possible for them to be under the old régime; indeed, priests and people alike were eager for the appearance of a strong leader among the Bishops.

This diagnosis of the situation was refreshingly cheering and hopeful; it showed that religion in Portugal had not



fallen so low as many of us had feared or believed. From countless conversations and discussions during the next six months I gathered that my informant's views were fairly correct in regard to the northern districts of the country; in the southern provinces, unfortunately, the state of affairs proved to be far less satisfactory.

At all events the Church of Portugal, for the first time in centuries, is now mistress in her own house. Bishops and clergy are at length freed from the gilded but paralysing chains in which they were so long held by a semi-infidel State, especially from 1834 to 1910. Bishops are now freely elected, or freely appointed by the Holy See. For the first time in many generations the Bishops have a free hand in the appointment and control of the pastors of the flock. These are inestimable advantages; they are advantages whose value will become more and more evident as time goes on, though it is imperfectly realized at present by the Portuguese clergy.

Among the clergy, at the same time, one discovers evidences of a new and worthier spirit. The Revolution has cleared the air. The time-servers, the men who had no vocation, hastened to accept the Government pensions, and to quit the sacred ministry for which they were so sadly unfitted. Among those who remained steadfast in the face of obloquy and persecution, a welcome spirit of enterprise, of activity, and of apostolic zeal is now not rarely to be seen. In Lisbon alone one could easily name quite a number of energetic and devoted priests, and there are a good many throughout the country as well.

The students in the seminaries are now of a somewhat better class than formerly, though there is abundant room for further improvement in this respect. Not the least of the Church's misfortunes in Portugal, during the best part of a century, has been the fact that so many aspirants to the priesthood were drawn from the lowest ranks of the people. In a democratic country, this might have done no great harm; but in a country like Portugal, steeped in aristocratic traditions, it was little short of pernicious. These men, by reason of their origin, seldom commanded respect from the nobles and the wealthy bourgeoisie. The fact that so many of them lived with their poor relations, while their poor relations lived on *them*, did not tend to gain respect for their person or their office.

The motives of these men in entering the priesthood were

too often of a worldly nature. They were under a constant temptation to labour rather for the benefit of their needy relatives than for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The story goes that, on one occasion, the father of a young priest was congratulated by a friend. 'I am very glad for your sake,' said the friend, 'you have now acquired a first-class milch cow for your family.' Many a youth was urged to study for the priesthood in the hope that he might become the mainstay of a group of struggling relatives.

In the old days, prior to the Revolution of 1834, the noble and well-to-do families of Portugal gave many of their sons and daughters to the service of God. In those days, the time-honoured law of inheritance was still in vogue; it was not unlike the law which still prevails in English-speaking lands. The eldest son succeeded to the estates; many younger sons entered the ranks of the secular or regular clergy, while many of the daughters became nuns. Indeed, the system was carried to such extremes that girls were frequently forced into convents against their will, and in violation of the express law of the Church—with results which may more easily be imagined than described.

After 1834, the 'morgados' were abolished, and a deadly blow was thereby struck at the power of the nobility. Indeed, the Liberals of 1834 may be truly said to have shattered the two chief supports of the throne, namely, the nobility and the clergy. A new law of inheritance—modelled on the French revolutionary law, which has been stereotyped in the Code Napoléon—was brought into force in Portugal, and remains in force, in a modified form, to this day. In virtue of this enactment, roughly speaking, all the surviving children are entitled to equal shares in their father's estate. The French law of succession is recognized as one of the most powerful factors in fomenting the deadly plague of race suicide, which is fast reducing France to the condition of a dying nation. Happily, the more elastic Portuguese law has not been followed by similar results, to any notable extent. But it has done much to prevent the younger sons of good families from joining the ranks of the clergy, by offering them the bait of a sufficient provision in the world. Above all, the wholesale suppression of religious houses in 1834, and the enslavement of the Church ever since—these things have broken the fine old tradition, and dried up the stream of religious and priestly vocations from the best families.



This is all the more regrettable, as the nobility and gentry of Portugal are among the most charming and delightful people in the world. As a class, they are distinctly the best and most devoted Catholics in the country. A friend of mine, who holds a high position in Lisbon, is fond of saying that the ladies of Lisbon saved the Faith in Portugal. From the teaching of catechism to the visiting of the sick in hospitals and of prisoners in jails, from the establishment of a home for the blind to the management of a Catholic circulating library—almost every good work of a religious or social character in Lisbon is conducted by a committee of ladies; and in these committees the guiding spirits are often ladies of title. One of the best assets of the Church in Portugal is the fact that the country houses of noble Catholic families are to be found in so many rural parishes, where the example and influence of such families, more especially of the ladies, are highly serviceable to the cause of religion. I know a district in which the pastor receives invaluable help, in a variety of ways, from two or three noble or wealthy families who spend portion of the year in the parishes which he administers; and I have no doubt that other zealous priests throughout the country could get similar assistance, if they sought it in the proper way.

But the trouble is that the clergy, for the most part, are unaccustomed to modern ways of working. I have often thought that it would repay a Portuguese Bishop to give some of his young priests a year's missionary experience in Liverpool or London. As it is, in most of the churches throughout Portugal, no confessions are heard on Saturdays, or on the eves of great feasts and holidays. On the eve of All Saints I visited the Estrella and Santa Isabel—two of the principal churches of Lisbon. The former was deserted, and the latter closed. The people who desire confession are hurriedly heard on Sundays and festival mornings, in the intervals between Masses. This is a thoroughly bad system, and I rejoice to say that it is not followed by the French Vincentians of S. Luiz or by the Irish Dominicans of Corpo Santo, whose example in this respect might well be copied by the Portuguese clergy. Another bad practice is that of keeping the churches closed between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m., just at the time when many people would be likely to pay a visit to the Blessed Sacrament.

Anybody who has had practical experience of parish work on modern, up-to-date lines, knows how important and

necessary is house-to-house visitation, especially in urban parishes. This class of work is sadly neglected throughout Portugal. No doubt it would be far from easy to get this work done properly, in view of certain unwholesome traditions which exist among the people, and which derive their significance from the fact that Portugal has always been weak in clerical celibacy. But a good deal of the work which a priest might not venture to do personally, he could get done, in one form or another, by the aid of lady visitors.

What we are accustomed to regard as the ordinary routine of Church work is strangely neglected in Portugal. Altar notices are not read at the Masses on Sundays, though such notices, apart from their intrinsic utility, might often furnish an occasion for an instructive little five-minutes' sermon. Such instructions are sadly needed in Portugal, where a profound and widespread ignorance of religion is one of the greatest evils of the day. The sermons of popular preachers are not very apt to remove this ignorance; they abound in rhetoric, in *concetti*, in sentimentalism. You seldom or never hear a really solid and instructive discourse from one of these preachers.

In many of the Portuguese churches there are no fixed Masses on week-days. Mass is said at an hour appointed by the person who gives the stipend. The poverty of the clergy forces them to acquiesce in this arrangement, which may be very convenient for a particular person or a particular family, but is highly inconvenient for everybody else, and obviously detrimental to the interests of religion. In Cintra, for instance, where many excellent Catholics spend the summer, they can seldom discover the hour at which Mass is to be said on a given day of the week.

The lack of sodalities or confraternities of a purely devotional character is another serious flaw in the Church's armour. It is true that the Third Order of St. Francis exists in many places, has possessions and endowments of its own, and does a great deal of charitable work for its own members. It is also true that, under the Law of Separation, every church is assigned to a certain Irmandade or Brotherhood, who act as trustees, and pay the priest's salary. But it is well known that a number of these Irmandades are infected with Freemasonry or encumbered with cranks, and that they are likely to work serious mischief to religion. For instance, the parish church of the Incarnation



—one of the most central churches in Lisbon—was happy in the possession of an energetic and devoted young pastor, who had been educated in Rome. His zeal proved distasteful to the Freemasons of the Irmandade, who took their revenge by closing the church on pretext of repairs. The church has remained closed for more than a year, and is likely to remain so indefinitely. The schisms and scandals to which the trustee system gave rise in the United States are more than likely to be renewed in Portugal by the Irmandades.

Yet, in days gone by the Irmandades in Portugal were admirable institutions. They corresponded, in some degree, to the Religious Guilds which flourished in medieval England and in the English parts of Ireland. Each trade had its own Irmandade or Brotherhood, its own chapel, its own festivals; and in great religious processions the Irmandades vied with one another in the splendour of their pageantry. In olden times the readiest way of starting an important work of charity was to organize a Brotherhood. When the devoted Irish Jesuit, Father John Holing, and his illustrious Portuguese confrère, Father Pedro Fonseca, resolved to found an Irish College in Lisbon, they went to work in the characteristic Portuguese way, by founding an Irmandade. Father Fonseca, who had the zeal of an apostle and was highly respected in Lisbon, was soon able to enroll a dozen of the leading nobles in his new Brotherhood. These nobles subscribed the necessary funds for acquiring a house, and for bringing a group of Catholic students from Ireland. In its first years (1593-1605), the College was supported and supervised by the Brotherhood; from 1605 onwards its administration was entrusted to the Jesuits.

Ireland was well and worthily represented in Lisbon by three institutions—St. Patrick's College, for ecclesiastical students; Corpo Santo, which served as a house of studies for the Irish Dominicans; and Bom Successo, a convent of Irish Dominican nuns. Each of these houses was founded and maintained, in large measure, by the generosity of friends in Portugal, the most eminent and open-handed of such benefactors being personages belonging to the royal family and the nobility. The debt which our nation owes to Portugal, for the help and sympathy so freely given to our race in dark and evil days, should not be lightly forgotten. It is a remarkable fact that all the Portuguese

writers of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, whom I have been able to consult in regard to the Irish establishments in Lisbon, bear unanimous witness to the unwonted piety and edifying lives of the Irish inmates of these houses. These Irish students, priests, and nuns seem to have made a strikingly favourable impression upon their contemporaries in Portugal.

Time has not effaced this good impression. To-day the Irish nuns of Bom Successo are in the unique position of having the only school in which religion is openly allowed to be taught in Portugal. Corpo Santo still remains one of the most popular churches in Lisbon. Ever since the time of that truly remarkable man, Father Daniel O'Daly, otherwise known as Dominic of the Rosary, who was the trusted envoy of Portugal in the crisis of her struggle for independence, Corpo Santo has seldom been without some priest of outstanding ability and zeal. For instance, the late Father Peter D. Hickey, O.P., was confessor to Queen Amelia, and I well remember the veneration in which he was held. The late Dr. P. B. Russell, O.P., spent over seventy years of his long life in Lisbon, where he knew all manner of distinguished people, and was held in the highest esteem.

The tradition is worthily maintained by Father Paul O'Sullivan, O.P., whose tireless energy enables him to edit two religious periodicals (the *Rosario* and the *Cruzada*), and to write most of their contents himself, besides conducting a large circulating library of Catholic books, relieving the needs of a crowd of poor people every week, and directing an excellent sodality for men. The two periodicals have a combined circulation of about 30,000 copies a month—a remarkable achievement in a country with a population of some six millions, of whom 80 per cent. are illiterate. The success which has attended Father O'Sullivan's efforts in founding and carrying on these various enterprises for the glory of God and the salvation of souls points a moral of its own. It shows that in Portugal there is a wide and fruitful field for missionary zeal. An Irish priest, gifted with energy and zeal, could exercise a veritable apostolate among people of the upper classes in Lisbon. Knowing the language well, and endowed with learning, tact, and courtesy, he would find himself among charming people, who would treat him as one of themselves. The late Father Singleton, Vice-



President of the English College, was, as one may say with pardonable exaggeration, the guide, philosopher, and friend of half the noble families of Lisbon. The work of a foreign priest among the middle and lower classes would be much less easy, partly for linguistic reasons, and partly also because these classes—with many happy exceptions—are not as well-disposed towards religion as are the higher orders of society.

Great masses of the people, especially in cities and towns, have become estranged from religion, partly because they are deplorably ignorant of what religion means, and partly because their minds have been poisoned against it. The enemies of religion in Portugal, as in other lands, have been wise in their generation. They have seized the schools; they have made it a penal offence to teach religion in any school in Portugal (with the solitary exception above noted), though atheism and every other evil doctrine may be freely taught in all schools, under the benign ægis of an anti-Christian government. Even under the Monarchy, when religion was supposed to be taught in the schools, many of the teachers were blatant unbelievers. In a very real sense the illiterates in Portugal were the lucky ones: they ran less risk of being corrupted than those who could read. Popular journalism was a megaphone in the service of infidelity; popular literature was a blend of irreligion and salaciousness.

The results are now visible in a marked deterioration of the national character and a steady growth of Bolshevism. In newspaper articles and private conversations, one reads or hears jeremiads without number and without measure on the debasement of the national character, the lack of moral sense among the people, and the decadence of the nation. Personally, I do not believe in half these lamentations, for the Portuguese are prone to exaggerate their failings beyond any people I have ever known. At the same time, these moanings contain a bitter residuum of truth.

To a learned man, who frankly told me he had no religion, and who bewailed the lack of character and of moral sense in Portugal to-day, I once made a rude but effective retort in this wise: 'It seems to me that in this country you persecute everything that is good, and you favour everything that is evil. You forbid religion to be taught in your schools, while atheism and every other demoralizing

doctrine may be taught without let or hindrance. You banish the Jesuits who could teach morality to your boys, and the nuns who could teach morality to your girls. You suppress and rob the Franciscan missionaries who strove to teach morality to your people throughout the country. You enslave the parish clergy. You persecute religion in every possible way for a century and more, and then you expect the masses of the people to be moral without religion. You harass and banish the communities of pure and holy nuns, but you protect and foster those other communities of women who ply their evil trade in so many streets of your cities with a shamelessness which would not be tolerated in any other nation of Europe. Again, if you look around, you will see an "extinct" convent or college in almost every street of your cities and towns. Each of these is a monument of robbery: it has been seized and confiscated from its rightful owners. Have not the Bolsheviks quite as much right to rob the Liberals, as the Liberals had to rob the Bishops, the Jesuits, the friars and the nuns?

The menacing growth of Bolshevism at home, and the prospect of losing their colonies abroad, have somewhat sobered the Republican rulers of Portugal. Time was when Republican leaders proclaimed the 'sacred right' of making and hurling bombs: they now find that 'sacred right' exercised against themselves. Last Christmas morning, within three or four paces of the former Irish College, a youthful revolutionist blew himself to pieces while trying to manufacture a bomb, and the premises were found to contain a regular arsenal of these weapons. A few days earlier a great store of bombs was accidentally discovered on the ground floor of an elementary school. Bombs are made to play a convincing part in labour disputes, and it is confidently predicted that they will play a decisive part in the coming Bolshevik revolution.

There is a serious danger that the country may pass through bankruptcy into Bolshevism. The national credit is at its lowest ebb; Portuguese money is reduced to about one-fifth of its normal value. Everybody recognizes that the financial position is desperate. Moreover, the Republicans have been repeating the very mistakes which brought destruction on the Monarchists. The two Monarchist parties—Progressives and Regenerators—split up, in process of time, into all manner of factions and fractions. In



the declining days of the Monarchy it became quite impossible for any of these factions to form a strong and stable government. A Progressive government would be opposed by some of the Progressives and by the whole body of the Regenerators. A Regenerator group, which essayed to form a government, would meet with a like fate; it would encounter opposition from some of the Regenerators and from all the Progressives. Over against these two clusters of Monarchist factions stood the Republicans, a formidable, compact, and vigilant body, ever ready to profit by the follies and faults of the upholders of the Monarchy. A similar fate has swiftly overtaken the Republicans themselves; they are now divided into feeble little factions, and menaced on three sides by the Monarchists, the Sidonistas, and the Bolsheviks. It is confidently predicted that the coming revolution will be a Bolshevik revolution, and will have the support, not only of Labour but of a large part of the army. Trotzky, who spent a year or two in Spain during the war, is said to regard Portugal as the ripest of western lands for the Bolshevik revolution which he eagerly desires. I have heard from a reliable authority that, in the event of a Bolshevik outbreak, especially if that outbreak should prove successful, certain foreign Powers have already determined to intervene. Foreign intervention, strange to say, is desired by a good many people in Portugal, who despair of any other method of solving the country's financial and political problems, though the experience of Ireland, India, and Egypt ought surely to suffice for an object-lesson and a warning.

The threatened loss of Portuguese East Africa has brought the Republicans face to face with further results of their folly. Portugal was rushed into the war by the so-called Democratic Ministry of Affonso Costa. The necessary funds—said to amount to something between 30 and 40 million pounds—were borrowed from England, and this loan was to be repaid within two years from the close of the war. Unable to pay in gold, Portugal will now be forced to pay in territory. England is said to have deftly made over her claim against Portugal to South Africa, whose territories will now be handsomely rounded off by the acquisition of Portugal's eastern colony. In one form or another, the annexation of this region to the British Empire is regarded as inevitable. Last year, no fewer than sixty Protestant missionaries went from England in a single

ship, to spread the gospel of British *Kultur* in Mozambique and its territory. Trade follows the flag, and the flag follows the missionary.

Even the Republicans have now come to recognize that the only suitable missionaries for Portuguese Africa are Catholic priests, preferably those of Portuguese origin. English Protestant emissaries, it is felt, are only too likely to exalt English prestige, and to inspire the natives with contempt for Portugal and the Portuguese. But the colonies, in both East and West Africa, have been denuded of Catholic missionaries by the fierce anti-clericalism of the Republic, while they have been invaded in force, especially of late, by Protestant missionaries from England. Confronted with this position of affairs, the Republicans have gone to Canossa. They have promulgated a decree which is meant to favour the education of Catholic missionaries in Portugal, and to facilitate their work in the colonies.<sup>1</sup> But the remedy would seem to have come too late. A good many years must elapse before a proper supply of trained missionaries can become available, and no man knows what fate may be reserved for the colonies in the meantime.

Twenty years ago the Holy Ghost Fathers had flourishing missions in Portuguese Africa, but the Fathers shared in the general proscription of religious Orders at the time of the Revolution. There is reason to fear that the Church of Portugal, in her sadly crippled condition, may be unable to undertake the evangelization of the colonies. It will be no easy matter to build afresh upon the ruins which the Republic has made. But the logic of events has forced the Republic to modify, in some measure, its illiberal and persecuting policy—and this is a distinct gain.

The perilous plight of the colonies forced the Republic to grant permission for the opening of colleges and novitiates for the training of missionaries. In like manner, the growing demoralization of the people at home has caused the Government very recently to connive at the return of certain teaching Orders of nuns, on condition that they abstain from wearing their habits. They will be allowed to teach religion *sub rosa*, not openly like the nuns of Bom Successo. It

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written, a new ministry signalized its brief tenure of power by annulling this decree. The present Government has shown a commendable spirit of tolerance. It was officially represented at the obsequies of the noble-hearted Archbishop of Evora, and adjourned the Senate as a tribute to his memory.



would seem that, in other respects also, anti-clericalism is passing out of fashion. Priests are no longer insulted in the streets, though they were constantly insulted in the days of the Monarchy. The newspapers, with some exceptions, are immeasurably less anti-clerical than they used to be in days gone by.

On the other hand, the leading Catholic journal of Lisbon, the *Epoca*, has become incomparably more influential than its predecessor of twenty years ago, called the *Correio Nacional*. The *Epoca* is now the third journal of Lisbon in point of circulation, and almost the first in point of influence. It is edited by Fernando de Sousa, one of the ablest and most distinguished journalists in Europe, a man who has been for twenty-five years a veritable lay apostle. His journal enjoys the collaboration of some of the most prominent politicians and scholars in Portugal. Independent of parties, it deals boldly with a great variety of questions, and seeks in all things only the moral and material benefit of the nation at large. Therein lies the secret of its success.

Oporto, in like manner, has a flourishing Catholic daily, called the *Debate*, which claims to be the journal of largest circulation in the north of Portugal. Various Catholic weeklies, such as the *Revista Catholica* of Vizeu, and the *Ordem* of Oporto, seem to have a fairly good circulation; but the country still lacks an important Catholic review. On the whole the position of Catholic journalism in Portugal to-day is vastly superior to what it was twenty years ago. It is also gratifying to note that, while there were only two Catholic bookshops in Lisbon in my time, now there are six, and they seem to be fairly prosperous.

If Portugal could have a Christian Brothers' school and a convent of teaching nuns in every town, the religious and moral condition of the country would be transformed within ten years. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but scarcely attainable just now. For the present, the most hopeful line of policy for the Catholics of Portugal would seem to be that traced out by the Centro Catholico. The idea of the Centro Catholico is to provide a platform on which Catholics of all parties can unite in defence of their civil and religious liberties. The Centro seems to offer unlimited possibilities of Catholic propaganda, besides furnishing a ready means of organizing the Catholic forces of the country. If the Catholics were thus organized

and united, they would be numerically far stronger than any other party ; they would be much more respected, because much more formidable, than they are at present.

It seems to me that the gravest peril which confronts the Catholics of Portugal to-day is not the danger of a Bolshevik revolution, which most people rightly dread. The real danger, I imagine, arises from within, not from without. There is grave reason to fear that the Portuguese Catholics may insensibly copy the mistake of the Catholics of France, who clung to the expiring cause of Monarchism or Imperialism while the bulk of the nation was steadily becoming Republican, until eventually the French Catholics—those worthy of the name—found themselves a pitiful minority in their own land.

Looking at the matter from another angle, there is but too much reason to fear that the Portuguese Catholics may repeat the mistake committed in the days of Henry VIII and Elizabeth by the Catholics of England, who lacked organization and took no proper pains to organize, but hoped wistfully for better days, while the forces of evil around them were daily growing stronger.

If the Catholics of Portugal were sufficiently organized, they could easily form the strongest and most numerous section of the people. But they are disorganized ; their leaders in many cases are timid. And so, in too many instances, they fold their arms and remain passive, fondly and foolishly hoping for better days. If they dwindle in numbers and influence, the fault will be largely their own. The means of strengthening their own position, and safeguarding the cause of religion, lie ready to hand if they will but use them.

M. H. MACINERNEY, O.P.



# DR. MURRAY OF MAYNOOTH

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY

## V

FROM the famine days the work of the soupers in Ireland had been carried on with vigour and with some success. But the success was very greatly in disproportion to the money lavished on the workers. One society received £54,000 in one year; in the same year a kindred souper society received £38,000 and at least five other 'missions' were actively at work. They made more converts in Connaught than was the total population! But they had 788 agents paid in Ireland; it was necessary to show zeal, and this they did by lies, lies, lies and insults of the grossest kind. Handbills were handed about in towns, and placards were on the walls all over the country, telling all and sundry:

Roman Catholics, are you aware of the astonishing resemblance between Romanism and Paganism?

Can Dr. Newman or any priest of the Church of Rome say in what respect does the Pope resemble St. Peter, save in one instance of his denying Christ?

How many shillings, crowns, half-crowns, and pounds are given in each of the chapels for all souls this year?

Why does Vice-Pope Paul Cullen prefer foreign missionaries to the home-bred offspring of the State-fed Maynooth?

Has not the Church of Rome borrowed the celibacy of her religious Orders from Paganism?

Is the Pope Anti-Christ?

Is it not evident that Romanism is only Paganism baptized?

In 1852 the Press of Ireland joined in rating Archbishop Murray for his neglect of Catholic children, which resulted in 150,000 children in the city being perverted! Strict stern inquiry found less than 100 victims. The campaign was galling to priests; the wiles, the lies, the insults, the captures real and alleged, led to results sad and sometimes peculiar. Fearful, merciless bigotry stalked the land, and led to hatred deep and lasting. And the vaunting of the preachers led many Catholics to believe in their success,

though not in their doctrine or practice. Hence, in Rome, the belief was general that Connaught had gone over *en bloc* to the new religion!

The Maynooth Professors had to teach controversy and controversial methods. They desuetuded writing, public controversy, and picking quarrels with the imported ranters, but they gave their students short, apt, simple answers to the many points which might arise. And they stood by their former pupils in controversy and in other difficulties. Several of Dr. Murray's correspondents, as their letters show, sought help from his knowledge—and from his kindly heart. 'Shipwrecked' priests wrote to him to intercede with their Bishops that they might be restored to their missions. In the bundles of old letters—he has carefully obliterated their names—he notes his replies on each sheet: 'Yes, poor man, I'll try what I can do, but he may refuse.' 'I am surprised, but cheer up and say your prayers; I write to the V.G.' A very pious, oily letter of request is marked 'Tartufe.'

Hence in Maynooth the clergy of sixty or seventy years ago had a real *Alma Mater*, their refuge and their help. As an example of strenuous help, I may quote from Dr. Murray's own letters to his sister the work of Maynooth in a big bigotry trial. In December, 1853, Rev. Vlademir Petcherine, C.S.S.R., was charged with Bible Blasphemy, the burning of the English Bible. He was a Russian nobleman, who gave up rank and fatherland for Catholicity. His missions in Ireland were famous and marvellously successful. In Kingstown, at a mission, he exhorted his hearers to burn publicly bad literature and fixed a time and a place in the church grounds for burning barrowloads of novels and bad literature. Two Bibles were amongst the bonfire material and such treatment of the holy book is a crime against old English law. At Mayo assizes in 1852 a person was found guilty and sentenced on a similar charge. The whole legal, clerical, landlord bigotry of Ireland was rampant and cried to Heaven and the judges for vengeance on the poor Redemptorist. The parsons proclaimed the crime throughout England, and she wept righteous tears and spent money to have the culprit overwhelmed with law, judges, pamphlets, newspaper comments and sermons. The Irish band of the Redemptorists was very small and Maynooth's help was sought. The Mayo case set the lines, and Dr. Russell 'primed' O'Hagan, the leader of the Bar, and



Dr. Murray coached Curran, 'the junior,' and he did more, he sat in Green Street Courthouse, when a wife murderer stepped out of the dock, and a priest, the poor stranger, stepped in, to plead before the court that he was not guilty of the charge. And Murray sat by his lawyer pupils the live long trial, hearing the bitter and bullying Crown lawyers, the stolid judges, examine and cross-examine the witnesses, who were hopelessly, though unwillingly, to break down under the fire of O'Hagan, O'Loughlin, and Curran. He watched the poor priest, worn and sad, prayerful and unheeding the trial, and grasped him by the hand, when the twelve men said 'Not guilty.' It was kind-hearted, brave, manly work. Yet it was undignified for a Maynooth Don to be in Green Street. Scores of Turveydrop clerics would not and could not descend to such practical sympathy. He revelled in the victory. His praise of the Catholic counsel is glowing.

The ranting and the writings of peers and parsons against Catholicity brought about the second royal Commission to enquire into the ways and works and wiles of Maynooth.

By geese (we read in history),  
 Old Rome was saved from ill ;  
 And now to *quills* of geese we see  
 Old Rome indebted still.

And the cursin' and damin' and thundrin' like mad,  
 We papists, God bless us, from Murthagh has had.  
 He says we're all murtherers—divil a bit less—  
 And that even our priests, when we go to confess,  
 Gives us lessons in murtherin' and wish us success.  
 When axed how he daar'd, by tongue or by pen,  
 To belie in this way seven millions of men,  
 Faith he said 'twas all towld him by Doethor Den,  
 An ould gentleman dead a century or two,  
 Who all about *us*, live Catholics, knew,  
 And of coorse was more handy to call in a hurry  
 Than Doethor McHale or Doethor Murray.<sup>1</sup>

The Maynooth Commission is worth reading. It shows the narrow bigotry of one or more of the Commission, and how well they were primed. It shows the silly nonsense, alleged to be given in Dens' theology. It shows, too, the apostates. And above all it shows the fine ability of the Maynooth staff, their fine work and their forbearance with the rudeness and narrowness of those who represented its

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Moore.

State endowment. Dr. Murray was a witness and was no disgrace to his loved college.

In Ireland of that day, as I have said, proselytism was rampant, and money for proselytes being very abundant there was quite a supply and demand; but the former was quite unproportioned to the latter. In Dublin there still exists a sign-plate telling the populace that the house is the home of the Priests' Protection Society. Possibly the Society has still members, clerks, secretary and funds. It is an extinct volcano; but a volcano which for long belched forth black and filthy matter. As it received attention from Dr. Murray and his contemporaries it may be interesting to give it a paragraph.

It had as patrons Earls Roden, Mayo, Erne, Castlemaine, Lord Dunsany, several Members of Parliament, and Protestant Church dignitaries. Its object was, as its circulars say, 'Reformation Amongst the Priests.' 'It is [the circular states] the only institution of the kind in these Kingdoms: and applicants from every part of Great Britain benefit by its protection as well as those from our own country.' It sent out circulars to ladies.

DEAR MADAM,

With the utmost reluctance I beg again to urge on your benevolent attention and Christian sympathy the absolute poverty and destitution of some of the converts of the Priests' Protection Society! At this moment the Society is unable to render *pecuniary* relief to them, and they are without a week's support. Consequently if not relieved *at once* they must die of starvation, go to the workhouse, or what would be hailed with joy by the Church of Rome, relapse *outwardly* to her profession.

In conclusion we may add this stupendous fact, which is not generally known, that a few perverts to a false creed have founded within a short period *Forty-three Chapels and Missions in England and Scotland*.<sup>1</sup>

These weeds from the Pope's garden, as Swift called them, were anxious to harass and annoy priests with insulting language, with vile tracts dealing with grossness. They ranted in market places. They stood at railway stations and set out to accompany priests into the streets and cities and towns. They forced their way into Maynooth College Library and harangued the student readers on celibacy! They mounted the college wall and threw bundles of tracts—blasphemous, lying, and gross—into the college grounds. Their captors hailed them as apostolic saints, whose conversion outbalanced their loss of Newman

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of Father James Maher, P.P.*, p. 338.



and his followers! Who were these men? They were not all Irish or Englishmen. Italy sent the vile Gavazzi, and the monster Achilli, and others. France sent her quota. England supplied about six, and the remaining dozen—for the captures numbered in all twenty-nine—were Irish. What sort of treasures were those wretched men? When asked if they should be re-ordained, the witty Father Healy replied tartly to the Protestant Bishop, who chaffed him, 'Give them the pledge, my lord, and they will cease to trouble you.' Simple solution, but were those men, men of talent, converts by conviction, men of learning? Hear Archbishop Whately, the author of *The Errors of Romanism*, and surely not biassed against his converts. The converts were of such a low grade that they would not be allowed to officiate in Protestant churches in Ireland and they were placed in England and Wales. Writing to the Bishop of Landaff, Whately says:—

My experience would have convinced me, had I doubted it, that some zealous Protestants are so eager for a convert, that they hastily take for granted a man being a sincere Protestant, if he does but echo all they say, and answer leading questions to their wish; when he is, as I have found in some cases, too ignorant (to waive all suspicion of deliberate falsehood) to be properly called either Roman Catholic or Protestant, from his knowing, I may say, nothing of the one religion or the other. Mr. — I found more ignorant of the Bible than you could suppose any child of twelve to be in a tolerable charity school. He set up, moreover, for a classical and mathematical tutor, and was believed on his bare word, until I found him unable to construe a simple Latin sentence, barely knowing the Greek letters and not knowing what a triangle is.

Several *professedly converted priests* have applied to me for preferment and in the meantime for licence to officiate in the diocese. . . . I have always examined them, and, though they varied in their degree of knowledge or rather ignorance, I have never met one who even approached such a qualification that I could conscientiously admit him to even the humblest office in the Ministry. One of these was a Mr. —, who has been making a figure as a controversial pamphleteer. . . . From this man himself I elicited a history of his conversion, which certainly might be called in our language a '*conversio per accidens*' totally at variance with the account sent me by —.

But Mr. —'s case is not necessarily unfavourable to the character of priests, since there is a great reason to doubt his being one. That he is a most impudent cheat was proved above two years ago. He never was a priest, and there is abundant evidence that he produced a forged letter and other such tricks.<sup>1</sup>

So, the much lauded clerical proselytizers were ignorant men, converts *per accidens*, 'impudent cheats,' according to their patron, Whately. In 1861 Dr. Murray, in a

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Whately*, vol. i. pp. 362, 363.

pamphlet, 'The Mendacity of Souperism in Ireland,' writes of those lapsed men :—

Touching the antecedents of a considerable portion of the Catholics who have apostatized during the last twenty years and upwards, my position in Maynooth College has enabled me to possess no small amount of authentic information. All those of whom I had such information, *without a single exception*, were, previous to their apostasy, men of damaged moral character, and their departure from the fold of Christ a relief, a strength, an edification to it. They were poisonous weeds in the Garden of the Church, and have found their fitting place among the dunghoops of heresy and schism.

Every man mixing with men makes friends with peculiar people, foolish brethren and false brethren. Do not St. Paul and St. Patrick mention that they had such in their circles? Murray had several foolish and false correspondents, amongst whom was Carleton, the novelist. Carleton had lapsed from the fold early, and wrote some bitter attacks on Ireland's priests and religion. He was a genius, kind, improvident, mean and bibacious. But through all, Murray befriended him, and in his little pocket account books are recorded his acts and gifts to the unworthy man, and in reply to Murray's gift at Christmas, 1862, Carleton wrote :—

RATHGAR AVENUE, DUBLIN,

December 23rd, 1862.

MY DEAR DR. MURRAY,

Thanks be to God, Mrs. Carleton is better, and my right hand will not be taken from me. I write to you to-day because I know that you must wonder at my silence, and my silence *to you*. I read your letter with sorrow and burned it immediately. Oh, I have much to tell you—much of the hollowness of pretended friendship from quarters where I could not have expected either faithlessness or want of sympathy. Your letter has placed you on the pedestal of my heart and in a loftier position than it ever had there. Had you relieved me from all my distress and heart-breaking struggles, I cannot esteem you and love you more than I do. X [I suppress the name, he was Carleton's constant and liberal benefactor and followed his coffin to the grave], at whose table—whenever he had his friends about him—was glad to have me as a welcome guest; X, the wealthy man—*abundant* in wealth and exalted by honour; X, who had in early life struggles probably as severe and depressing as ever bore me down—never answered the letter which I told you I had written to him—abandoned me in what I myself told him was a last struggle for my family. I asked him for only thirteen pounds to secure to my widow and orphans the provision I had made for them. No, *he was silent*. Going through life, my dear Murray (*sic*) especially when the spirit is fixed upon the world, the pride of life and its empty honours are a [word illegible] that always corrupt the heart. I cannot understand how or why any man possessed of wealth can shut up and check his sympathies against the necessities of those who, in right of intimacy, ought to have a claim on him. I will not say of friendship, because I do not wish to prostitute



that sacred word, because if *true* friendship existed the melancholy claim would be allowed and generously responded to. As for you, you responded to it as far as lay in your power, and as I know from your last letter even farther. I have not time to write more, or I will be late for the post, and I wish you to have this letter to-morrow. God grant you many happy returns of this sacred season. You will hear from me soon again—very soon, for I have much to tell you,

Ever my Dear Murray,

Most faithfully and affectionately yours,

W. CARLETON.

THE REV. PATRICK MURRAY, D.D.

This letter is not quoted in O'Donoghue's *Life of Carleton*, and it is interesting as showing the love of the kind and zealous professor for the wretched and miserable novelist. Murray to the very end of his days had a great appreciation of Carleton's genius, and hoped and prayed in vain for his return to the true fold.

In 1863 the Bishop of Clogher, Dr. McNally, sought a co-adjutor. He had been Prefect of the Dunboyne establishment in Maynooth, and his wish was to secure the services of his brilliant pupil, Professor Murray. Dr. Murray's colleagues had been offered and accepted dioceses. But one of them preferred his dear old college home. Dr. Russell was about to be appointed Archbishop of Bombay, Bishop of Down, Archbishop of Armagh, but succeeded always in escaping the burdens of office. It is said that Dr. Murray would have accepted gladly the see of Clogher, and the votes of the pastors of the diocese gave him a large majority. Whether his wish was purely for the glory of God and the honour of Clogher, who can tell. Perhaps his wretched health in the college may have strengthened his wish for change. Perhaps he was one of those who would

Rather bear with those ills we have  
Than fly to others that we know not of.

Perhaps those pastors judged their chosen one, carefully, on each of the Pauline notes. It was and is said that he was not unwilling to accept the dignity, the burden, the cares of the see. 'Si quis episcopatum desiderat, bonum opus desiderat. Oportet ergo episcopum irreprehensibilem esse . . . sobrium, prudentem ornatum,' etc. In a word, the judgment of many pastors declared that Dr. Murray possessed in an eminent degree the qualities enunciated by St Paul. The pastors were Ulstermen and hence very knowing and business like, and they judged that for the administration,

discipline, and kindred acts of judgment that make up the constant round of official life he was 'dignissimus.' At that time all sorts of exterior influences and anxieties were given to aid the Roman authorities in their work of selection. The Italians wondered at all, and used their own judgments. Indeed, so wonderful, so unceasing, and so many were the letters from English-speaking clerics to the Propaganda, that Propaganda formed certain opinions of men and matters. A Jesuit warned the Bishops of the folly and the effects of painfully angry and denunciatory letters ; but it took the genial banter of Father Burke, O.P., to laugh such literature away. He explained that Ireland was famous for linen, and that the best washgrounds and bleachfields for soiled linen are to be found where Shannon and Barrow and Blackwater flow, not to speak of the shores of Erne and pastoral Bann. Soiled linen should not be exported.

*Frazer's Magazine*, renowned for its famous contributors, among whom were Father Prout and William Allingham, was anxious to aid Dr. Murray's candidature. Think of a famous London magazine being vigilant and anxious that Clogher Papists should be well shepherded ! It wrote :

Dr. Murray, the famous Maynooth professor, poet, and essayist, is selected by the priests of Clogher to be their Bishop. He is a man of learning and standing in the Irish Church. The second on the List is a Father Donnelly, an ignoramus, noted for nothing save the huge money bags brought from America for Dr. Cullen's University.

Murray was greatly pained by these lines. He scorned such tactics and such aid. But the scribe lied. The 'ignoramus' had a good college course. An old Maynooth Prize List reads : 'Primum Praemium, Jacobus Campbell, Armachanus ; Joannes Forrest, Cloynensis ; Jacobus Donnelly, Clogherensis ; Secundum Praemium, Daniel McCarthy, Kerriensis ; Thomas Nulty, Midensis ; Henricus Harbison, Armachanus.<sup>1</sup> Father Donnelly became Bishop, and Dr. Murray remained in his beloved college. It was said that Archbishop Cullen had no great love for Maynooth, and no burning love for Murray, who showed sympathy with Charles Gavan Duffy.

Our indiscretions sometimes serve us well  
When our deep plots do fail, and that should learn us ;  
There's a divinity that shapes our ends,  
Rough-hew them as we will.

<sup>1</sup> *Irish Monthly*, 1892, p. 313.



God saved Dr. Murray to finish his great life work, his famous tract *De Ecclesia*, and to continue the guide and friend of Ireland's students.

Controversy was the burning subject of the nineteenth century. What did Christ teach? Did He found a Church, an infallible Church? What are its marks? The Tractarian movement led Protestants to study history, dogma, controversy. The Law Church in England and Ireland scoffed at Catholic claims, laughed at the idea of indefectibility, at the alleged promise of the Founder that the gates of hell should not prevail against her. They saw the Pope, surrounded by cruel foes, his kingdom passed away, the Papacy seemed to be no more a force. They raked history for cases of schism, of cruelty, of vice and shouted 'Is this the Church without spot or stain?' Defenders of the Church were not wanting, but their defences were isolated—sometimes poor, sometimes weak, and, alas! sometimes yielding to the attackers through ignorance or weakness. A standard work was needed; one to state the Church's doctrines and claims, clearly and accurately, without excess, without defect; a book which would explain fully the various propositions, such as the divinity of the Church, her unity, and above all her infallibility, and the infallibility of the Pope, not then a defined doctrine. Then unceasingly and exultantly new difficulties and objections were raised in countless magazine articles, pamphlets, books and tracts. The existing textbooks, on the Church were meagre, poor, dealing with the old objections of Luther, Melancthon, Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, Cranmer, and ignoring all modern thought. Newman in a letter refers to the inept methods of Perrone in regard to English controversy. Murray read every attack, quoted it, and answered it.

The labour of collecting and arranging matter, the planning of the huge work of 2,000 pages, the physical drudgery of writing it in Murray's slow neat handwriting, must have been immense. And what must have been the mental toil in writing with such admirable clearness and accuracy the many theses, explanations, and refutations. At once the work was recognized as the most complete and exhaustive work in that wide branch of theological science. Even in the French and Roman schools it was admitted to be the highest authority. Maynooth was, on the Continent, scorned and suspect, not fairly nor impartially, but through the concerted attacks in Parliament and in the Press; an

idea had become fixed in many continental colleges and universities that Maynooth was a home of silent mediocrity, of ignorant men and badly disciplined boys. Murray's work proved the falsity and unfairness of the charge.

Dr. Murray was a man of sound judgment, and reckoning the demand for such a work as his, he issued an immense first edition, a thousand sets of a three-volume octavo of 2,000 pages. No publisher in these kingdoms could or would take now such a huge work, And Murray's publisher was McGlashan, whose tricks and sins are manifested by Carleton and by Lever in many letters.<sup>1</sup> Murray drove a good bargain with the Scot.

To Father Perrone, S.J., the leading theologian of the day in Rome, Dr. Murray sent a copy, and the learned Jesuit wrote a long letter of thanks and compliments for the treatise, which displayed 'fullness of doctrine, clearness of method, and wide knowledge of writers, ancient and modern.' Pius IX, to whom the author dedicated the work in 1866, expressed his acknowledgment in a rescript to Dr. Murray in which he gives him special thanks, *gratias singulares*, and encourages him by his blessing and exhorts him to continue by his keen judgment and wide knowledge to vindicate the Apostolic See from the calumnies of its bitter enemies. It is worthy of remark that in the dedication of the work to the Pope in 1866, four years before the definition of the doctrine, Dr. Murray wrote that it was reserved for the venerable Pontiff to define Papal Infallibility. 'Tibi tamen, Beatissime Pater, reservata est singularis gloria dogma istud sententia infallibili definiendi.' Nowhere else can such a fine explanation of the prerogatives of the Papacy be found. Friends and foes recognized this, and appreciations and bitter recriminations and denunciations of the work appeared. From his many old pupils remain letters complimentary. From English and continental scholars, bishops, professors, and reviewers, came letters of thanks and greetings, and, what was soothing to Dr. Murray's anxious mind, his debt to the publisher was reduced almost to a minimum by the sale of 480 sets of the work within five months of its publication.

The Professor culled all the attacks and many of the eulogies in a scrap-book for future use. The *Quarterly Review* and some Irish and English Protestant prints were enraged

<sup>1</sup> *Charles Lever : Life and Letters*, vol. i. pp. 76-156.



at the book, its arguments, its refutations, its daring to mention the Papal infallibility, its madness in trying to prove it and to make it a definable doctrine. A convert parson, Edward G. K. Browne, of Warwick, wrote to the author, 'You have left no loophole for escape. The critics see that the Roman Catholic Church is the Church built on the rock, that it and its head are infallible. Hence their rage.' In a compendium of the work, issued a few years after, Dr. Murray stated that his work *De Ecclesia Christi* was the first theological treatise ever written in Ireland by an Irishman, and printed and published by Irishmen.

E. J. QUIGLEY.

[To be continued.]

## MR. T. A. LACEY, ST. CYPRIAN AND 'CATHEDRA PETRI'

BY REV. B. V. MILLER

IN two of his recent books, *Catholicity* (1914) and *Unity and Schism* (1917), the Rev. T. A. Lacey, whose influence among a section of Anglicans is deservedly great, and whose competence and persuasiveness as a controversial writer Catholics freely acknowledge, has given a good deal of attention to St. Cyprian's views about the constitution and government of the Church, and his theory of ecclesiastical unity. This is only natural; St. Cyprian's writings have long been the happy hunting ground for all those followers of the anti-Roman chase who hope to add the Pope to their bag. But with this main question we, at present, have nothing to do. Learned Catholic scholars of international reputation have often treated it at length, and it would be presumptuous for us to try to add anything to what they have written.

Our aim is much more modest. Mr. Lacey makes much of one small point, which we believe to be new; at any rate we have not come across it before, and though it is only a question of the meaning to be given to two words, it assumes, in his hands, a considerable importance, and therefore, especially as he makes out what, at first sight, seems to be a good case, we think it deserving of our close attention.

In the much debated fourth chapter of the *De Unitate Ecclesiae* St. Cyprian uses the expression *Cathedra Petri*, which has always been taken to mean the Chair of Peter or the See of Rome. Mr. Lacey, however, now contends that it means nothing of the kind, but that St. Cyprian uses it simply as a synonym for the episcopate or for episcopal authority in general. This is certainly a rather startling proposition, which, at least, does credit to its author's originality and ingenuity. If it were true St. Cyprian's ecclesiology would be even more of a thorn in the flesh to Catholic theologians than it is already. We propose then to examine Mr. Lacey's argument, and to see how far he has



succeeded in proving his case, or whether his attempt has failed.

Luckily there is plenty of ground common between us. There is no question of the authenticity of the text, no accusation of fraudulent interpolation. Mr. Lacey fully accepts Dom John Chapman's conclusions on this point.<sup>1</sup> In fact, he tells us that he had come to the same conclusions himself, independently of, though later than, Dom Chapman. With this common ground to stand on, we may follow Mr. Lacey's excellent example of reproducing the whole of the chapter, with the two texts, A and B, both equally St. Cyprian's work, side by side. The text is that of Hartel, in C.S.E.L., to which edition also reference is made in all quotations from St. Cyprian's letters.

*De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate, c. 4.*

Quae si quis consideret et examinet, tractatu longo atque argumentis opus non est. Probatio est ad fidem facilis compendio veritatis. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum : Ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus et super istam petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferorum non vincent eam. Dabo tibi claves regni coelorum : et quae ligaveris super terram erunt ligata et in coelis, et quaecumque solveris super terram erunt soluta et in coelis.

A. Et idem post resurrectionem suam dicit : pascere oves meas. Super unum aedificat ecclesiam et illi pascendas oves mandat suas, et quamvis apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem, unam tamen cathedrum constituit et unitatis originem atque rationem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri quod Petrus, sed primatus Petro datur, ut una ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur. Et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur. Hanc et Pauli unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit ?

Qui cathedram Petri super quam fundata ecclesia est deserit, in ecclesia se esse confidit ?

B. Super unum aedificat ecclesiam, et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat : sicut misit me Pater et ego mitto vos. Accipite Spiritum Sanctum : si cujus remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi si cujus tenueritis, tenebuntur, tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. Quam unam ecclesiam etiam in canticis canticorum Spiritus Sanctus in persona Domini designat et dicit : una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matri suae, electa genetrici suae. Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet tenere se fidem credit ? Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit in ecclesia se esse confidit ?

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Revue Benedictine*, vols. 19 and 20.

Quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens: Unum corpus et unus spiritus, una spes vocationis vestrae, unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus.

On the question of priority of text, Mr. Lacey, who takes A to be the original form, differs from Dom Chapman, who decided in favour of B, and considered A to be the amended text. Here, too, for the sake of having as wide a common platform as possible, we may side with Mr. Lacey, and the more readily, as in this we have the authority of Mgr. Batiffol,<sup>1</sup> who is able to show good reason for his choice. We may likewise accept with him the reading 'hanc et Pauli unitatem,' instead of 'hanc et Petri unitatem,' just towards the end of A. We join issue with him, however, upon the reasons which induced St. Cyprian to alter the text in the later edition of his treatise.

But first of all we must enter a protest against Mr. Lacey's speaking of the '*suppression*' of the first text; this is to prejudge the issue, for the question really is whether there was any suppression, occasioned by the misuse by his adversaries of some of St. Cyprian's expressions, or whether it was simply a case of emendation in order the better to fit a different set of circumstances.

Dom Chapman's theory as to the priority of the text B, is that the treatise, originally designed to meet troubles at Carthage, was afterwards sent to Rome at the time of the Novatian schism, and that the changes were then made in order to make it more suitable to the particular circumstances of that Church. With this theory as such we are not directly concerned, but only with Mr. Lacey's reasons for rejecting it. He denies that 'the phrase *cathedra Petri* looks to the particular circumstances of that Church. St. Cyprian does not so use it. This point is of some importance because on it turns St. Cyprian's theory of the equality of bishops.'<sup>2</sup> We must now quote Mr. Lacey at some length, otherwise it would be impossible to do justice to his argument.

He writes<sup>3</sup> :—

The term *cathedra Petri* does not occur in Christian literature before his time, but there are indications of use unlike his. When Tertullian

<sup>1</sup> 'L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme,' Excursus E.

<sup>2</sup> *Unity and Schism*, p. 179.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 179 ff.



spoke of the *cathedrae apostolorum* as continuing in the Churches of express apostolic foundation,<sup>1</sup> it is obvious that a *cathedra Petri* might be sought at Antioch or at Rome, both Churches claiming St. Peter as founder. That, however, is not St. Cyprian's use. In *De Unitate* 4, the *cathedra Petri* is clearly identical with the *una cathedra*. But the *una cathedra*, as the whole argument demands, is unquestionably the bishop's seat of authority in each several Church, the seat of the 'episcopatus unus atque indivisus.' Dom John Chapman allows this, adding the remark that at Rome this seat was the seat of Peter.<sup>2</sup> But to press that is to spoil the argument about the *una cathedra* and the *primatus* of Peter. The indivisible apostolic and episcopal authority holds the Church in one; this is exactly what was given to Peter (*parem potestatem tribuat . . . hoc erant et ceteri*), and the first place was given to him singly for the purpose of demonstrating that unity. Thus episcopal authority, wherever constituted, is designated by the term *cathedra Petri*. The whole argument then coheres; to be in the Church is to be with the bishop, he who separates himself from the bishop '*cathedram Petri deserit*.'

Compare these passages :—

(a) Cyprian addresses Rogatianus, whose deacon was defying him :—

'Cum pro episcopatus vigore et cathedrae auctoritate haberes potestatem qua posses de illo statim vindicari.'<sup>3</sup>

(b) He speaks of the faction of Felicissimus at Carthage, and of his own authority as bishop :—

'Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui aut sacerdotium novum fieri praeter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest.'<sup>4</sup>

(c) He says that Cornelius was duly promoted Bishop at Rome :—

'Cum Fabiani locus idest cum locus Petri et gradus cathedrae sacerdotalis vacaret.'<sup>5</sup>

(d) He writes of Novatian, making a faction at Rome :—

'Qui episcopo Cornelio in catholica ecclesia de Dei iudicio et cleri ac plebis suffragio ordinato profanum altare erigere et adulteram cathedram conlocare et sacrilega contra verum sacerdotem sacrificia offerre temptaverit.'<sup>6</sup>

It is clear that the *cathedra una* is the same, alike, at Nova, at Carthage, and at Rome; that in each case, alike, it is *cathedra Petri* or *super Petrum fundata*; that Felicissimus; and Novatian stand in exactly the same relation to it, as also Cyprian and Cornelius. This seems to leave no room for doubting that in *De Unitate* 4, as the context implies, *cathedra Petri* is a synonym for the episcopate.

The conclusion seems a somewhat hasty one, scarcely warranted by the premisses. Mr. Lacey looks naturally for further literary evidence of the use of the term in this sense; but before following him in this we must show how unstable is his argument so far set forth.

<sup>1</sup> *De Praesc.*, 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Cath. Encycl.* s.v. 'Cyprian.'

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* iii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ep.* xliii. 5.

<sup>5</sup> *Ep.* lv. 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Ep.* lxxviii. 2.

The argument from the text of *De Unitate* itself is weak, because it leaves out of account the circumstances in which the treatise was composed. If it had been first written without any reference to Rome, Mr. Lacey's reasoning might, at least, be accounted probable; but if St. Cyprian composed it directly with a view to sending it to Rome as a contribution towards the settlement of the Novatian schism, and altered it afterwards in issuing a second edition meant for non-Roman readers, Mr. Lacey's interpretation becomes highly improbable, for in that case it is clear why St. Cyprian first inserted and then left out the *cathedra Petri* and the *primatus Petri* and made the other changes. Now it seems quite clear that this latter hypothesis is the correct one. There can be no doubt that the treatise was sent to Rome, along with the *De Lapsis*, almost immediately upon its appearance. St. Cyprian refers to both of them at the end of Ep. 54, congratulating the Roman confessors upon their return from schism to unity: 'Quae omnia penitus potestis inspicere lectis libellis quos hic nuper legeram et ad vos quoque legendos pro communi dilectione transmiseram.' The reading of the two books, before the bishops assembled in synod at Carthage, and the sending of them to the Romans, were evidently actions over and done with when Cyprian was writing this letter, and the use of the same pluperfect for both of the actions suggests, for Cyprian is usually careful with his tenses, a certain measure of simultaneousness for the two of them. The final sentence of the letter confirms this hypothesis: 'Quem libellum (i.e. *De Unitate*) magis ac magis nunc vobis placere confido, quando eum jam sic legitis ut et probetis et ametis; siquidem quod nos verbis conscripsimus vos factis impletis quando ad Ecclesiam charitatis ac pacis unitate remeatis.' It will now please them more and more, for, having returned to the Church, they will read it with approval and love. But why 'more and more' unless they had already read it, but with less pleasure, while they were in schism? If then Cyprian sent his treatise to the schismatics at Rome as soon as he had read it to the bishops at Carthage, it is at least most probable that, in writing it, he had the Roman situation in mind; and we can then see just why he makes so much of the position of Peter.

Upon Peter, he tells his Roman readers, Christ founded the Church; to him He said, 'Pasce oves meas'; He



established one chair; what Peter was, that, indeed, were the others, but yet the *primatus* is given to Peter; all this is of special application to the situation at Rome, because, although there is one chair in each several Church, at Rome this is the chair of Peter. To separate from the one chair anywhere is schism and a crime, but at Rome this crime has a special enormity, since there it is to separate from the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church is founded. We also see that the situation at Rome gives special point to the introduction of Paul, who had laboured there, for at Rome this unity of the Church was not Peter's alone, but Paul's also. Mgr. Batiffol<sup>1</sup> points out several other indications which give great cumulative force to the argument that *De Unitate* was composed in view of the Novatian schism, and therefore with an eye to the special circumstances of the Roman Church. This fully accounts for the emphatic insistence upon the name and place and chair of Peter. Later on, however, when the author issued a second edition, meant for more general circulation, the circumstances were different. It was more important then to insist upon the authority of each bishop in his own church, there was nothing to be gained by giving emphasis to the chair of Peter, and Cyprian, therefore, retouched these passages, thus making them of universal application. By pressing the fact then that, though the *cathedra Petri* is identical with the *una cathedra*, yet at Rome this is the chair of Peter, we by no means spoil Cyprian's argument as it runs in text A. But rather, it is only by pressing it, that we can bring out the full force of the argument as being particularly well adapted to the circumstances prevailing at Rome. Mr. Lacey, on the other hand, through his failure to note that the treatise was originally written against the Novatian schismatics, neglects its historical context and so misses the point of St. Cyprian's careful phrasing.

It is not easy to see how the other passages, which he quotes by way of comparison, help his thesis. The first refers to the local bishop, Rogatianus of Nova, exercising the authority of his chair. This, of course, is a common phrase with Cyprian, but has no bearing whatever upon the meaning of *cathedra Petri*. Nor is the second more relevant, for 'one Church and one chair founded upon Peter' is a very different thing from one chair which is the

<sup>1</sup> Op. et loc. cit.

chair of Peter. The third passage rather tells against Mr. Lacey, for here the episcopal chair is by identity, the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter, or in other words, the bishop's chair at Rome is Peter's chair. The fourth quotation is as wide of the mark as the first, and proves equally nothing. To use a formal distinction, we might say that 'the *cathedra una* is the same alike at Nova, at Carthage, and at Rome' according to the specific likeness, but at Rome it is the *cathedra Petri*, according to individual and material identity, which is not the case anywhere else. Mr. Lacey fails altogether, then, to prove from the text itself that 'in *De Unitate* 4 . . . . *cathedra Petri* is a synonym for the episcopate.'

He is fully aware, on the other hand, that there is little historical evidence for this use of the phrase. In his earlier work, *Catholicity*, he could quote but one passage, which comes in an anonymous sermon wrongly attributed to St. Augustine.<sup>1</sup>

In his present book<sup>2</sup> he adds some quotations from Gildas, which have been supplied by a friend. But from neither source does he really get much help. The passage from the sermon need not be reproduced here, since our readers will find it in full in the second nocturn lectures read on the feast of St. Peter's Chair.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Lacey writes<sup>4</sup> : 'the text shows that in the neighbourhood, and at the date of its delivery, the festival was not related to the establishment of St. Peter at Rome, but to the original establishment of the apostolate, and consequently of the episcopate, in his person. It was held in honour of the sacerdotale officium in general.' Rome certainly is not mentioned; but the preacher refers directly to Peter's establishment in the episcopate, not, as Mr. Lacey says, in the apostolate—'Petrus hodie episcopatus cathedram suscepisse referatur'—as the origin of the festival, and if tradition counts for anything, this can point back to nothing except his establishment as bishop in Rome. It may be in the speaker's mind that in this festival is honoured the 'sacerdotale officium' in general, but, quite clearly, that is only an application of the primary signification of the feast. The episcopal office is honoured first of all in the person of Peter, first among bishops, and in connexion with his chair,

<sup>1</sup> *Catholicity*, pp. 130, 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Unity and Schism*, pp. 182, 183.

<sup>3</sup> *Roman Breviary*, Feb. 22.

<sup>4</sup> *Catholicity*, p. 131.



which is at Rome ; and in the second place only is it honoured with respect to bishops in general. There is not the slightest indication that *cathedra Petri* would or could be used by the preacher to mean simply the episcopate. Following immediately upon this sermon, Migne <sup>1</sup> prints another, not mentioned by Mr. Lacey, *In Cathedra S. Petri*, which, on internal evidence, is very probably by the same unknown writer, and which begins : ‘ Quamvis solemnitas festivitatis hodiernae a nobis merito honoretur, quia dum Natalem Cathedrae colimus, episcopatum Petri apostoli veneramur.’ This again shows that it was Peter’s episcopate, and necessarily his episcopate at Rome, that was meant by the phrase *cathedra Petri*, and not episcopal authority in general.

The passages Mr. Lacey quotes from Gildas are from his *Increpatio in Clerum* <sup>2</sup> and run thus :—

c. i. Sedem Petri apostoli immundis pedibus aliquos usurpantes, sed merito cupiditatis in Judae traditoris pestilentem cathedram desiderantes.

c. ii. Judam quodam modo in Petri cathedram Domini traditorem, et Nicolaum immundae haereseos adiutorem in loco Stephani martyris statuunt.

c. xxiv. Petro ejusque successoribus dicit Dominus : Et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum : vobis vero : Non novi vos ; discedite a me operarii iniquitatis.

And he concludes : ‘ It is clear that Gildas (saec. vi.) regarded every bishop as occupying an apostolic see, which was expressly *cathedra Petri*. We may either trace in this the influence of St. Cyprian or find in it evidence that he was not altogether singular in his use of the phrase.’ <sup>3</sup>

But this is almost funny. It engenders the suspicion that Mr. Lacey has taken these quotations on trust from his friend, without verifying his references, or at least without reading the context.

It would, in any case, be a long cry from the polished diction of Cyprian to the turgid eloquence of Gildas, and we should have to hunt far to find any traces of the literary influence of the African upon the Briton. But we need only read Gildas to see that he does not mean what Mr. Lacey says he means. Giving free rein to his indignation Gildas seeks everywhere for examples and metaphors, the better to show up the depravity of the British simonists,

<sup>1</sup> P.L. 39<sup>2101</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> P.L. 69<sup>967</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> *Unity and Schism*, p. 183.

who by the way are not confined to the bishops alone, as Mr. Lacey insinuates, but include all ranks of the clergy, 'sacerdotes, ministros, clericos.' And what better example could he find than Peter contrasted with Judas? To usurp the seat of Peter, the apostle; to sit upon the pestilent chair of Judas, the traitor; to put Judas into the chair of Peter — what are these but metaphors, far-fetched, perhaps, but realistic and well calculated to drive home his accusation? In the long passage whence Mr. Lacey takes his third quotation, Gildas, striving to bring the clergy to some sense of dignity of their office, recalls to their minds many of the Scriptural texts which were read during the ceremony of their ordination or consecration. Among these is St. Matthew,<sup>1</sup> which he takes phrase by phrase as addressed to a true bishop, and then quotes other words which are to be applied to the unworthy:—

Vero sacerdoti dicitur: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam. Vos quidem assimilamini viro stulto, qui aedificavit domum suam super arenam. Itidemque quod sequitur eadem sonat dicendo: Et portae inferi non praevalerunt; ejusque peccata intelliguntur. De vestra quid exitiabili structura pronuntiatur? Venerunt flumina et flaverunt venti et impeerunt in domum illam et cecidit et fuit ruina ejus magna. Petro ejusque successoribus dicit Dominus: Et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum: vobis vero: Non novi vos; discedite a me operarii iniquitatis.<sup>2</sup>

But who does not see that this is merely a rhetorical and moral application of Christ's words in view of the present circumstances? Any preacher to-day might speak in just the same way. For Mr. Lacey to draw his conclusion is to verge on the absurd, and for his suggested use of *cathedra Petri* as a synonym for the episcopate, Christian literature supplies no evidence.

On the other hand, this phrase, or some very similar phrase, as a distinctive appellation of the Roman see or bishopric, has in its favour a long line of literary tradition, much of it being African. It would be passing strange if Cyprian alone, the literary heir and pupil of Tertullian, were to have used this expression in this unfamiliar sense.

Tertullian,<sup>3</sup> though not mentioning the *cathedra Petri*, has something very like it: 'Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident. Si Italiae adjaces habes Romam.' The idea is there, very probably the phrase was already in use,

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi. 16 ff.

<sup>2</sup> P.L. 690.

<sup>3</sup> De Praesc. 36, P.L. 238-9.



and the meaning is clear. The *cathedra* is the symbol of the authority of that apostle who ruled the Church as bishop. We find it in the anonymous *Poema contra Marcionem*, which is probably African and of the fourth century:

Hac cathedra, Petrus qua sederat ipse, locatum  
Maxima Roma Linum primum considerare jussit.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Lacey<sup>2</sup> thinks indeed that Optatus of Milevis used the expression to mean the apostolic see, but adds that

In his curious expression *cathedra Petri quae nostra est* there seems to be an echo of the language of St. Cyprian, and this appears even more clearly in his remark about the succession of Maiorinus from the *cathedra Petri vel Cypriani*.

Most certainly this is an echo of St. Cyprian's language, but it gives a very different sound from what Mr. Lacey thinks he can detect in it. The passage runs<sup>3</sup>: 'Nec Caecilianus recessit a cathedra Petri vel Cypriani, sed Maiorinus, cujus tu cathedram sedes, quae ante ipsum Maiorinum originem non habet.' The meaning is absolutely plain to anyone who will follow the argument. *Cathedra Petri* is a very common expression with Optatus, and it always means the see of Rome. So the other expression 'cathedram Petri quae nostra est'<sup>4</sup> cannot possibly mean what Mr. Lacey suggests, seeing that it refers back to the beginning of this book, where Optatus speaks most distinctly of *cathedra Petri* 'in urbe Roma . . . . . in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus,' and then goes on to show that the Donatists have no part in this.

The phrase is found in the *Opus historicum* ascribed to St. Hilary<sup>5</sup>: 'Hoc enim optimum et valde congruentissimum videbitur, si ad caput, idest ad Petri apostoli sedem, de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes.' This passage, even if not from the pen of St. Hilary, which is uncertain, remains a testimony, and probably a Gallic one, to the traditional meaning of the expression.

Mr. Lacey, quoting<sup>6</sup> St. Augustine's<sup>7</sup> 'cathedra . . . Ecclesiae Romanae in qua Petrus sedit et in qua hodie

<sup>1</sup> P.L. 211<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> *Catholicity*, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> *De Schism. Donat.* i. 10; P.L. 11<sup>004</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 9.

<sup>5</sup> P.L. 10<sup>639</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> *Catholicity*, p. 133.

<sup>7</sup> *Cont. Lit. Petil.*, ii. 51; P.L. 43<sup>300</sup>.

Anastasius sedet; vel Ecclesiae Jerosolymitanae, in qua Jacobus sedit, et in qua hodie Joannes sedet,' thinks that 'it does not show how he would have employed' the expression *cathedra Petri*, if he had ever used it. To us it seems to show this very clearly; he would have employed it to denote the see of Rome individually. But if any doubt remains, perhaps the two following passages, not mentioned by Mr. Lacey, will remove it:<sup>1</sup> 'In canonicis Scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illae sint, quae apostolicas sedes habere, et epistolas accipere meruerunt,' and,<sup>2</sup> 'Quis enim nescit illum apostolatus principatum cuilibet episcopatui praeferendum? Sed et si distat cathedrarum gratia (i.e. Petri et Cypriani) una est tamen martyrum gloria.'

And finally St. Jerome uses the phrase, not only in his 'youthful letter to Damasus',<sup>3</sup> as Mr. Lacey 'admits with, perhaps, a touch of scorn, but also in his maturer years,'<sup>4</sup> 'praedicationem quoque cathedrae Marci evangelistae, cathedra Petri apostoli sua praedicatione confirmet.'

As far as literary tradition goes, therefore, Mr. Lacey has not a leg to stand on. But he still seeks some support in one of Cyprian's own letters. He quotes the whole of the 14th paragraph of the 59th letter, in which St. Cyprian tells Pope Cornelius all about Felicissimus and his faction, who, having been condemned by a synod at Carthage, had sent emissaries to Rome to lay their case before Cornelius. Cyprian is very angry indeed about the whole affair; he does not spare Felicissimus, whom he accuses of all sorts of offences against faith, discipline, and morals. But he seems most disturbed in that, refusing to submit to the judgment and excommunication passed upon them in Africa, these schismatics and disturbers of the peace:—

Navigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est ab schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides apostolo praedicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non potest accessum.

If the words 'ad Petri cathedram . . . exorta est' be Cyprian's own, then, admits Mr. Lacey,<sup>5</sup> 'a great part of

<sup>1</sup> *De Doct. christ.* ii. 8, P.L. 34<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> *De Bapt. cont. Donat.* ii. 2, P.L. 43<sup>127</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Catholicity*, p. 132.

<sup>5</sup> Ep. 97<sup>4</sup>, P.L. 227<sup>92</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> *Unity and Schism*, p. 184.



my argument fails'; we should say that the last shred of it disappears. He maintains, therefore, that they are not St. Cyprian's words, but 'a quotation from the letter "*ab schismaticis et profanis*" which the appellants carried with them—a justification, in fact, of their appeal.'<sup>1</sup> He thinks that the words '*nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis, etc.*'—which occur a few lines lower down—seem to strike directly at the expression '*ecclesia principalis*'; and for the other reasons which lead him to this conclusion he refers back to the second chapter of his book. There we read that these words are not Cyprian's own, because

They are in violent contradiction with what he immediately proceeds to say. He denounces this action of a handful of ruined and desperate men as based on a pretended inferiority of African bishops. His angry protest is incompatible with the recognition of any *principalitas*; he makes Carthage, or indeed any one of the small African Churches, the equal of Rome. I do not think that he could in the same breath use the words quoted. We know, moreover, his opinion about the origin of the *unitas sacerdotalis*, the one united episcopate and to find the source of it in the Roman Church would be contrary to his express teaching. We know in what sense he spoke of the *cathedra Petri*, and it would be against his use to place it specifically at Rome. The conclusion seems imperative that he quoted the words in question, not without some touch of scorn, from the 'schismatic and profane' letter which the appellants took to Rome for their credentials.<sup>2</sup>

Our readers will see at once how much there is in this of unproved assertion, how much too of *petitio principii*. Mr. Lacey persists in reading his own preconceived meaning into Cyprian's words, and leaving out of sight all that runs counter to it. We note first of all how misleading is what he says about the phrase '*nisi si paucis desperatis, etc.*' This is in reality quite a usual form of expression throughout this letter to indicate the factionists. It occurs in c. 2, '*cum summa desperatione*,' '*ut perditorum minas*,' in c. 6, '*a quibusdam desperatis et perditis et extra ecclesiam constitutis*,' in c. 8, '*convicia perditorum*,' and in c. 11, '*homines desperati et perdit*.' There is clearly no special relation between that phrase here in c. 14, and the appeal to Rome, to the '*ecclesia principalis*'; there is not even any special relation between it and their refusal to submit to the African bishops; they are '*desperati et perdit*' simply because they are guilty of all sorts of crimes, and are excluded from the Church, with no apparent hope of

<sup>1</sup> *Unity and Schism.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 37.

reconciliation, owing to their perverse obstinacy. Cyprian reckons it indeed a crime that they do not submit to this judgment which has been passed upon them, not lightly, but with full knowledge of the case and of their many excesses; he reckons it a crime, and rightly so, that such men should despise the authority of the bishops of those parts where their excesses were committed and their schism consummated; he reckons it a crime that they should go about the province leading the faithful astray; it is an offence to him that they should go roaming about attempting, by their lies and deception, to break up the harmony that reigns among all the bishops; he looks upon it, perhaps, as a specially grave crime that they should go to Rome, where also they had already been judged and cut off—‘abstenti’; but above all he reckons it a piece of audacity, that these men, emissaries of heretics, who have broken faith with God, and of schismatics, who have broken the unity of the Church, should dare approach the Chair of Peter and the *ecclesia principalis* whence began the unity of the episcopate. In that is their audacity, that schismatics and heretics, already condemned and repelled as well at Rome as elsewhere, should try to gain over to themselves the Chair of Peter, and the starting-point of unity. And it is not only audacity, but also, Cyprian seems to think, fruitless and therefore stupid audacity, inasmuch as they forget that there they will find ‘those Romans whose faith was praised by the apostle, and among whom bad faith—“perfidia”—can have no entry.’

Read thus, in the obvious way, the whole phraseology is most natural, and entirely in accordance with St. Cyprian’s line of thought, as well as with his usual terminology. There is no need whatever to suppose that he is quoting from the letters carried by the appellant schismatics. Such a supposition is wholly gratuitous, being neither required by the context nor supported by any evidence whatever. Before we close we must make a protest against Mr. Lacey’s disingenuous use of imperfect quotations from Firmilian’s well-known letter to Cyprian in connexion with the controversy about the rebaptizing of heretics. He writes<sup>1</sup>: ‘Cyprian’s ally in this dispute, Firmilian of Caesarea, wrote with fierce sarcasm of the “stultitia” of Stephen, “qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem

<sup>1</sup> *Catholicity*, p. 126.



Petri tenere contendit,' and 'qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se praedicat.'<sup>1</sup>

This certainly makes it look as if Firmilian called Stephen a fool for claiming to sit in Peter's chair, and so possessing some higher authority. But of course it is nothing of the kind. The accusation of open and manifest foolishness is launched against Stephen's supposed inconsistency and failure to live up to his claims. He claims to hold the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church were laid, and yet, by receiving heretics without baptizing them afresh, 'brings in many other rocks and builds up anew many Churches' instead of one; the Apostle admitted that 'the Jews, though blinded by ignorance and burdened by heavy crime, were zealous for God, but Stephen, who says he sits in Peter's chair, is moved by no zeal against heretics.' The charge of foolishness appears, therefore, under a very different light.

Mr. Lacey then fails altogether to make out any case for his novel interpretation of *cathedra Petri*. St. Cyprian does not use it in an original and otherwise unknown way as a synonym for episcopal authority anywhere, or the episcopate in general. It has with him just the same meaning as with Tertullian, Optatus, Augustine, the whole line of African tradition, the same meaning as with Stephen, Jerome, Hilary or pseudo-Hilary, and all the Latins who use the term; it is the Chair of Peter which is by identity and exclusively the See of Rome.

With the rest of Mr. Lacey's exposition of St. Cyprian's theory of the Church we have now no concern, nor do we wish to attempt any justification of the Saint's views as a whole. That his theory was an inadequate one few will be found to deny, but that it was either so false or so hopelessly inadequate as would appear from the interpretation usually given by Anglican writers has been abundantly disproved by most competent scholars. Our only aim has been to show that Mr. Lacey has gone astray on this one small point, which is of some interest and importance, and in this we venture to think that we have not wholly failed.

B. V. MILLER.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Epp. 75, 17.

# NOTES AND QUERIES

## THEOLOGY

### ABSOLUTION GIVEN IN IGNORANCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—A confessor's faculties expire on a certain day. Without being aware of the fact, he hears confessions as usual and absolves from sins and censures. Will you kindly state in a few words what is the result.

VICARIUS.

The absolution from sins is valid. There is no longer any necessity for a 'coloured title': the Church will supply jurisdiction when there is 'common error' regarding the grant of faculties (209). And, seeing that the priest himself is unaware of the true state of affairs, we may take it that the people generally are labouring under the same misapprehension.

As for censures, the reply is furnished by Canon 2247. 'If a confessor, in ignorance of the reservation, absolves a penitent from censures and sin, the absolution from censure is valid, provided the censure be not one *ab homine* or very specially reserved to the Holy See' (§ 3). The four comprised in the second category are given in Canons 2320, 2343 (§ 1), 2367 and 2369 (§ 1).

### MULTIPLE IMPEDIMENT AND DISPENSATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—A and B are doubly first cousins—their fathers are brothers and their mothers sisters. They wish to be married. A document is sent to the Bishop, and through him to Rome, stating that A and B are 'related in the second degree' and are anxious for a dispensation. The reply is favourable: the Bishop executes the dispensation and A and B are married. Now, three months later, the omission is detected by the curate who assisted at the marriage.

Is the marriage valid? If not, what steps are to be taken to set matters right?

There are several cases of multiple consanguinity that have given me trouble for the last year or two. Would you kindly indicate the various ways in which the impediment may arise under the new legislation.

SUPPLEX.

As regards 'the various ways in which the impediment of multiple consanguinity may arise' we would ask 'Supplex' to consult an article



in an earlier issue.<sup>1</sup> We tried to review the old teaching in the light of the new principle that 'the impediment is multiplied only as often as the common stock is multiplied' (1076, § 2). The points are two numerous to be discussed again. But we think that our correspondent, after sifting the evidence, will come to the conclusion (1) that the new legislation has restricted the impediment and simplified matters very considerably, but (2) that even now cases may arise in which even all the wisdom of the experts will not enable us to come to a fully satisfactory decision.

On the question of dispensation, though, there is no room for doubt. The dispensation in the case is valid, and so is the marriage. Of course, a want of candour in explaining the facts of the case is an offence against morality and against the canons, and may entail serious penalties—'If, in a petition [sent] for the purpose of securing a rescript from the Holy See or from the local Ordinary, any one, through fraud or malice, keeps back the truth or puts forward a falsehood, he may be punished by his Ordinary as the gravity of his offence demands' (2361). But we are not now considering the moral character of the petitioner's action: our concern is with the objective value of the document secured. And the very canon just quoted (2361) adds 'without prejudice to Canons 45 and 1054.' The first of these (45) indicates that, provided one 'motive' cause is stated properly, a *Motu proprio* concession is wide enough to cover all subsidiary defects: the second (1054) that, in case of minor matrimonial impediments, a dispensation holds even when the one 'final' motive alleged proves to be without foundation. There is no special reference to another canon (1052). But it too must be taken into account in our effort to distinguish between validity and lawfulness. 'A dispensation,' it tells us, 'from an impediment of consanguinity or affinity, granted in any degree of the impediment, is valid even though in the petition or concession an error regarding the degree has crept in—provided the degree actually existing is more remote [than the one alleged]—or though no mention whatever has been made of another impediment of the same species in an equal or more remote degree.'

The last clause manifestly covers the case submitted by 'Supplex.' In the line of consanguinity, the existence of 'another impediment of the same species in an equal degree' means simply that we have a 'multiple' impediment—say, a double blood-relationship of the second or third degree. And, when such is the case, the canon assures us that the dispensation covering the first impediment—or, if you prefer, the first portion of the double impediment—will cover the second also, even though (culpably or inculpably, advertently or inadvertently, for the Code makes no distinction) no mention was made of the second in the document sent by the petitioner.

Why then trouble about multiple impediments at all? If the dispensation from the first impediment covers the second as a matter of course, why not abolish the second impediment completely? At first

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, February, 1919, Fifth Series, vol. xiii, pp. 131-4.

sight the suggestion seems plausible enough. But, especially perhaps when the lines are unequal, a little consideration makes it clear that the old system cannot be wholly disregarded. For, when two individuals are (say) first cousins on the paternal side, and second cousins on the maternal, everyone who knows anything about relationship will see at once that there are two distinct obstacles to a valid union. First cousins cannot be married, and the parties are first cousins; second cousins cannot be married, and the parties are second cousins. So long as the general principle, voiding marriage to the third degree (1076, § 2), is maintained, there are, therefore, two distinct canonical facts for which the legislator is logically bound to make distinct canonical provision. But matters may be pushed too far; and indeed that was the tendency under the old legislation. Impediments arose in cases against which an expert might be on his guard, but in which the ordinary layman or woman might be excused for detecting no trace of a multiple relationship. So, to make provision for all sides, the Code has fixed upon a golden mean. It has (a) re-affirmed the principle of multiple consanguinity, (b) restricted it (1) indirectly, by limiting the simple impediment to the third degree, (2) directly, by eliminating cases of double descent from the *same* common stock (1076, § 2), (c) secured mention of the multiple relationship by threats of drastic measures against anyone rash enough to disregard it (2361), but (d) safeguarded the validity of marriage by providing that, whatever the guilt of the parties concerned, a dispensation covering the disclosed portion of an impediment shall extend implicitly to the other (equally or less important) portion that has been allowed to pass unnoticed (1052).

This last concession, though, implies probably less change than might be at first suspected. There are good grounds for saying that it only states in an explicit and satisfactory form the principle on which the Roman Congregations always acted. True, the Instruction issued by the Propaganda on the 9th May, 1877—the most explicit we had on the matter—enumerated double consanguinity (n. 4) among the things that ‘either by law or custom or Curial style had to be expressed, so that, if even unknowingly the truth regarding them were concealed or a falsehood stated, the dispensation would be rendered null and void.’ But, apart from the fact that a good number of these requirements emerged from the commentators’ hands in a very attenuated form,<sup>1</sup> we have evidence enough that the intention was to secure a valid marriage in spite of reticence on minor matters. One of the commonest clauses, for instance, in the Datory dispensations was ‘*ac aliis [impedimentis] bona fide forte reticitis*’—a concession that was certainly meant to extend to most of the cases for which provision is now made in Canon 1052. Even when no such clause was added, and when the double impediment was afterwards detected, the remedy was found, not in the concession of a new dispensation, nor (we admit) in a declaration that the first document

<sup>1</sup> For the modifications generally accepted, see, e.g., Gasparri, nn. 382-8 (footnotes).



was quite irreproachable, but in a slightly mysterious 'tertium quid'—the letters *perinde valere*—that would seem intended to rouse up, so to speak, the energy latent in the first concession. A prominent French canonist gives his own experience. 'Researches [he says] that I made some time ago in connexion with a concrete case failed to disclose any instance in which a marriage had been declared null and void on the grounds that the dispensation had reference to an impediment of consanguinity represented as simple, when, in reality, multiple or combined with another of a lower degree.'<sup>1</sup>

This, of course, is now largely theoretical. But it gives us additional confidence in interpreting a canon that, apart from evidence of previous practice and development, might be regarded by some as unduly liberal and generous. On the other hand, the restrictions imposed by the canon itself must be kept in mind. An error or omission regarding the degree *will* vitiate the dispensation, (1) when the degree actually existing is less remote than the one mentioned in the petition, (2) when, in case of a multiple impediment, the less remote degree is left unmentioned. If two individuals are first cousins—related in the second degree—a dispensation given for the third degree will be useless; and the same will be true if, when they are related in the second *and* in the third degree, the closer relationship is not recorded in the document.

#### PLACE OF DEATH

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly solve the following in your next issue. A, with a party in a motor at top speed, is shot through the head or brain in parish B. In half a minute the motor gets into parish C. In another half minute it runs into a field and stops, still in parish C. A messenger from the motor goes for a priest, saying that he believes A to be alive. In about two hours a priest from parish C attends A, but cannot say that he is then alive. The dead body remains in parish C a day before removal. Where did the death take place? As you are aware, results of some importance depend on the reply.

M.

'M.'s' case is rather gruesome. However:

1°. If there were question of 'real' death, parish C would be the scene—almost certainly. Medical science has made it pretty clear that, in cases of this kind, life continues for a very considerable time after death appears to have taken place.

But, 2°, so far as the 'results of some importance' are concerned, we are fairly safe in assuming that the authorities did not make 'real' death the test. They were thinking of 'apparent' death—of 'death' as generally understood. Where that took place, in the case given, we are not in a position to say. It is a question of fact—to be decided on the evidence of the witnesses and medical experts.

<sup>1</sup> A. Boudinhon in *Le Canoniste Contemporain*, January-February, 1920, p. 21.

### BEQUESTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES—THE O'HAGAN CLAUSE

REV. DEAR SIR,—I have been reading with some interest a reply given in your June (1920) number in connexion with charitable bequests. I am in the same position as 'Leo,' except that the property is of very little value and that I have good reasons for saying that the testator wanted to give it to me to make use of as I please. Several times during his life he gave proof that he wished to make me his legatee, though I know well that he was anxious to do something for the hospital mentioned in his will. The will is useless in law. May I not assume that he was more or less indifferent as between the hospital and myself? Or would you hold that it was quite impossible for him to leave the property to me, once he had mentioned the hospital at all?

On the wider question, there is one point that I do not see very clearly. If priests generally admit your conclusion, if they say they consider themselves bound to apply the proceeds of an invalid will to charitable purposes, will lawyers not take that fact as a proof that, among priests at any rate, there is a trust? And will a judge not take the same view, and give the whole property to the next-of-kin? That would be a disastrous result. By interpreting our obligations too strictly, we may be depriving deserving charities of any chance they have of securing even portion of the property.

A reply at your convenience will oblige.

DEVISEE.

'Devisee' raises an important, though of course obvious, difficulty. If the obligation in conscience is acknowledged by priests generally, is there not a trust after all, and will not the situation be construed in that light by every exponent of the civil law? To which our answer is the same as before: there is no 'legal' trust of any kind whatever, but there is an obligation in another sphere—a sphere with which in this case the civil law has no connexion—the sphere of individual conscience. That is a distinction that must be drawn by everyone who gets entangled in matters of this kind. When the testator is quite capable of dealing with his property, and when his intention has been satisfactorily expressed, then—no matter how far we extend the State's 'overlordship' in regard to temporal legacies—in the line of charitable bequests it is his wishes, not the civil law, that the legatees are in conscience bound to follow (1513-4, 2348): and we doubt very much whether, once the position of the civil law is accepted and acknowledged, any competent upholder of its claims would base a 'legal' decision on facts that affect only the private relations of the devisee to his own conscience and to God Himself. Whether the obligation is admitted by only one priest or by every priest in Christendom has little bearing on the matter. In neither case is there any trace of a legal trust; and, that once admitted, all objections based on merely civil law would seem to us absolutely futile.

We admit, of course, that in a given case there may be no obligation even in conscience. It is a matter to be decided after a careful review of all the circumstances. We may imagine, for instance, that the testator was a very special personal friend of the devisee; or that he was



keenly interested in general charitable projects that the devisee had undertaken ; or that he had, in one or other of a thousand ways, indicated that he was just as willing to have the property managed by the devisee as applied to the charity mentioned in the civilly invalid portion of his will. In cases of that kind the devisee might very well find conscientious reasons for turning the money to his own use, or for applying it to the charitable objects he has most at heart. But these are not the cases we dealt with in the reply to which 'Devisee' refers. We were concerned with a man who had practically no personal relations whatever with the deceased, and who could suggest no satisfactory reason—except the one we favoured—why he should have been chosen for the unexpected honour and responsibility.

In confirmation of our view that the distinction drawn above would be recognized by civil lawyers, we may, with the Editor's presumed permission—we have no time to ask it formally—subjoin some extracts from an article published by Mr. J. M. Dohan in a recent issue of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*.<sup>1</sup> It will probably give 'Devisee' more satisfaction than anything we could say on the subject. The writer deals with 'the validity of bequests for Masses,' gives many interesting particulars regarding English and American law,<sup>2</sup> and towards the end gives us the record of a case clearly bearing on the issue raised by 'Devisee':—

In Pennsylvania [he says] the Legislature, in 1855, enacted a statute voiding a devise or legacy 'to any person in trust for religious or charitable uses,' if made within one calendar month of the testator's death and escheating to the commonwealth all property 'held contrary to the intent of this Act.'

The Pennsylvania statute was construed in the case of *Flood v. Ryan*, 220 Pa. St. 450, 13 Am. & Eng. Cas., 1189, the note in the last named volume being interesting and instructive. Patrick Jeffers died 24 August, 1903. On the 10th of that month he had executed his will, its sixth clause being: 'All the residue of my estate I give, devise and bequeath unto St. Teresa's Church, Broad and Catharine Streets, and St. Joseph's House for Homeless, Industrious Boys on Pine Street, share and share alike, provided, however, in case of my death within thirty days from the date hereof, I give, devise and bequeath all my said residuary estate unto the Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, absolutely.' A sister and sole heir of the testator brought suit, claiming that the devise was void under the Act of 1855, the devise being not to the Archbishop personally but manifestly intended for the use of the two charities named.

When the matter came up for hearing in the courts, the Archbishop was called upon to define his attitude in regard to the bequest, and the distinction between 'law' and 'conscience' soon came into prominence:

Upon the trial of the action, which was ejectment for five pieces of

<sup>1</sup> June, 1920, pp. 646-54.

<sup>2</sup> One small statement of his has been questioned (*ibid.*, September, 1920, pp. 289-92), but it has no bearing on our problem.

real estate, Archbishop Ryan testified with marked frankness as follows : ' The law does not impose on me to give \$10,000 which I receive without any qualification by a will. I have it ; it is mine. Then comes in another law, higher law, which says, " You have received that money ; you can keep it ; the State has no right to interfere with you ; in natural justice it is yours ; but you are a bishop and you have the care of the poor and the afflicted, and you ought to use it as the moneys intended for their benefit, though it is not mentioned in the will." . . . I received the money as in this will case. It is mine ; I can use it as I please, as far as the law is concerned, and there is no prohibition, legally or otherwise—that is, by law, no ecclesiastical law ; but if I have reason to believe that this man, as I did not know him, never heard of him before, has left me this money, whatever it is, for some good purpose, and because I am a bishop, then my personal conscience—it might not influence other bishops—but my personal conscience, if it is at all sensitive, would suggest to me that large sum of money or property was left to you for no personal reason ; it must have been left to you as a bishop for some good purpose. Then I take that money or that property, the value of that property, and I put it into a fund which I have for religious and charitable and educational or other good purposes. This property I know was not intended for me personally, though before the law it is, and I own it and I can do what I please with it. . . . Q. Your Grace, in your examination last Friday you were asked this question : " If a man provided in a will that all the rest, residue and remainder of my estate, real, personal and mixed, I give, devise and bequeath unto St. Teresa's Church, Broad and Catharine Streets, and St. Joseph's House for Homeless Industrious Boys on Pine Street, share and share alike, that language would indicate, would it not, that those were his favourite charities ? " and you answered " Yes." You so testified, did you not ?—A. That was in a conditional will. If he made a will saying " I leave these properties to these charities," I would find myself obliged, legally and otherwise, to give them to what they were intended for. But he makes two wills, so to speak, or he makes one will which is conditional. He says, I leave it to these charities if I survive this will for thirty days ; if I do not survive this will for thirty days, if I do die before the thirty days—here is the second condition—the second will—I leave it to Archbishop Ryan. Therefore, as he did not survive the thirty days, the second will leaves it to me.—Q. And in connexion with the two charities, of course ?—A. Not in connexion with the two charities, because he has willed two things—first, if I live for such a time I leave it to the charities ; second, if I don't live for such a time, I leave it to Archbishop Ryan. And then I do with it as I please, by leaving it to the charities or doing anything else I please with it. As I said, I should think my personal conscience would be to give it to some charity, and I give it to that general fund. My conscience, however, would not have to bind others.'

The result is described :—

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania held the devise a valid one, the substance of the decision being that if a devise is made in consideration of a promise to execute an invalid or unlawful trust, equity will not allow the devisee to profit by his fraud and will raise a resulting trust in favour of the heir or next of kin of the testator ; but where there is no bargain between the testator and his devisee, the devise is good, although the



intention of the devisee is to carry out what he believes to be a wish of the testator which could not be made a condition of the devise.

Brown, J., speaking for the Court, said in regard to the testimony of the Archbishop :

'There could be no fuller acknowledgment of a moral obligation, nor a stronger avowal of an intention to discharge it, but our decrees do not go out to compel the performance of a mere moral duty. *In foro conscientiae* conscience is the sole chancellor, whose decrees we are as powerless to enforce as we are to provide penalties for their violation.'

And the practical conclusion is drawn :—

In conclusion, it is well to know that for practical purposes in the State of Pennsylvania, a Catholic who is called in to assist a dying testator in drafting his last will and testament may very well insert the following clause in the end of the will : 'In the event of my death within one calendar month from the date of the execution of this my last will and testament, I give, devise and bequeath the property heretofore devised and given unto the above enumerated charities, unto the Most Rev. Dennis J. Dougherty, as Archbishop of Philadelphia, absolutely' ; being careful to add the qualifying word, 'absolutely.'

As for 'Devisee's' own case, we are not in a position to say anything definite. He has given us none of the proofs of benevolent disposition exhibited by the testator in his lifetime. But we can well believe that they are fully convincing. He must just take them all together and, with or without help from his friends, come to a decision as to what were the testator's wishes. We do not 'hold it impossible' for a testator to leave property for the personal use of a legatee, once he has mentioned a charity. He may so word his will as to give full effect to his wishes : and, even when there is no special wording, the extrinsic evidence may be strong enough to establish his predominant intention.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

## CANON LAW

## THE OBLIGATION TO EXPEND THE SUPERFLUOUS REVENUES OF BENEFICES ON CHARITY AND PIOUS PURPOSES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Our theologians have always taught that a beneficiary is obliged to expend the superfluous fruits of his benefice on charity or pious purposes. I have read the section of the Codex treating of benefices and have not seen this obligation expressly mentioned. There is mention made of such an obligation in Canon 1473 but it is not very clearly expressed. It says 'although a beneficiary may have other property (non-beneficial) he can make free use of such fruits of his benefice as are necessary for a decent living ; but he is bound to expend the superfluous fruits on charity or pious purposes.'

It is perfectly clear from this canon that a person having non-beneficial property, and enjoying a benefice besides, is obliged to expend on charity the superfluous fruits of his benefice. Does this canon impose the same obligation upon the person who has no private means but is merely living on his benefice ?

Could it be that the Codex does not wish to impose the strict obligation in the latter case ?

SACERDOS.

We have got no doubt whatever that Canon 1473 imposes an obligation to expend the superfluous revenues of their benefices on charity or pious purposes on all beneficiaries, not merely upon those who are also in the enjoyment of other non-beneficed property. As the grammatical structure and meaning are clearer in the Latin form, we give the canon in the original : 'Etsi beneficiarius alia bona non beneficialia habeat, libere uti frui potest fructibus beneficialibus qui ad ejus honestam sustentationem sint necessarii ; obligatione autem tenetur impendendi superfluos pro pauperibus aut piis causis, salvo praescripto can. 239, § 1, n. 19.' Now, anybody who analyses the sentence beginning with the word *obligatione* must see that its subject is *beneficiarius*, not *beneficiarius qui alia bona non beneficialia habet* : the point is so clear to us that to prove it would seem to us to be labouring the obvious. It follows, therefore, that the obligation of expending superfluous revenues on charity or pious purposes applies to all beneficed persons without distinction.

## THE NECESSITY FOR A DECLARATORY SENTENCE IN 'LATÆ SENTENTIAE' PUNISHMENTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly explain Canon 2232, § 1, in the pages of the I. E. RECORD ? Does it imply that the old distinction between punishments which prevent the acquisition of rights and those which take away rights already acquired has been abolished ? If so, then these latter punishments will usually impose an obligation even in



the external forum without any declaratory sentence, and consequently the new legislation is in this matter much more strict than the old. Must we admit that the tendency of the Code in this matter is rather to strictness than to moderation? Your commentary on this very practical canon would be welcomed by many.

SACERDOS.

Canon 2232, § 1, states that

A punishment *latae sententiae*, whether medicinal or vindicative, binds *ipso facto* in both *fora* a delinquent who is conscious of his crime; nevertheless, before a declaratory sentence the delinquent is excused from the observance of the punishment whenever he cannot observe it without self-defamation, and in the external forum no one can require of him the observance of the same punishment, unless the crime is notorious, without prejudice to the prescriptions of Canon 2223, § 4.

To get a proper grasp of this very important section, as well as to elucidate our correspondent's difficulties, a brief sketch of the pre-Code teaching as to the necessity of a declaratory sentence in *latae sententiae* punishments is necessary. In this matter one gets very little light from consulting the sources of Canon Law themselves: neither in the Decretals nor in any subsequent legislation was there any formal enactment on the point. One has to rely mainly on the practical interpretation of these punishments as manifested in the writings of canonists and theologians.

In this connexion it was usual to distinguish between positive and negative punishments. The former consist primarily in some physical effect, they always require for their execution either some positive physical action or the omission of some physical action. Hence in this category are included not only fine, exile, imprisonment, etc., which involve positive physical acts, but also fasting and those other punishments which are executed by abstaining from physical acts. In the latter class, however, what is aimed at chiefly is some positive effect which is brought about by this abstention, as, for example, the affliction of the body by fasting. On the other hand the effect of a negative punishment is moral, that is to say, it is primarily concerned with rights. It sometimes happens, indeed, that for its complete execution the placing or omission of a physical act is necessary; but, whenever this is the case, the physical effect is secondary and follows merely as a consequence of the loss of right. Thus privation of a benefice for its complete execution requires that the possession of the benefice should be given up, but this is only a consequence of the loss of title which is the primary effect of this penalty.

Negative punishments are subdivided into two classes: those that prevent the acquisition of rights, and those that take away rights already acquired. To the former belong all impediments to offices, benefices, and other ecclesiastical rights. The latter category includes such penalties as privations of pensions, offices, benefices, dignities, etc. Censures belong partly to the one class and partly to the other.

Most phases of this question were disputed; on a couple of points,

however, there was unanimity. All were agreed that prior to a declaratory sentence, a criminal was not bound to execute a *latae sententiae* punishment, whether positive or negative, if defamation to himself would be the result.<sup>1</sup> The basis usually relied upon for this conclusion was the extreme harshness involved in obliging a man to defame himself. Canonists and theologians had such a keen appreciation of the difficulties of this obligation and of the frequency with which it would be violated that they regarded its imposition outside the scope of positive legislation.

It was generally agreed, too, that there was an obligation to execute censures prior to a declaratory sentence, with, of course, the exception contained in the preceding principle.<sup>2</sup> The unanimity on this point is a matter for no little wonder, considering the silence of Canon Law and the fact that the reasons upon which it was based were not of an absolutely compelling character. It was due, we think, principally to the consideration that medicinal punishments leave the criminal the right to absolution, if he repents. The obligation which they impose is really alternative : either to execute the punishment, or to repent and have it removed.

Except on the two phases just dealt with there was much controversy on this question. The differences of opinion, however, were not always of the same seriousness, in fact on some points there was a close approach to unanimity. In regard to positive punishments, in which the words *ipso facto* or *latae sententiae* alone were employed, it was generally accepted that there was no obligation before a declaratory sentence.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, if such expressions as *nulla sententia praemissa* or *ante omnem sententiam declaratoriam* were also used, canonists commonly held that the punishment imposed an obligation without a declaratory sentence, but even in this case not a few, relying on custom, insisted on the necessity of a declaratory sentence.<sup>4</sup> Practically the same division of opinion existed in regard to negative punishments which take away rights already required : the general opinion was that whenever such words as *ipso facto* or *latae sententiae* alone were employed a sentence was necessary ; but that it was not required if a clause, such as *nulla sententia praemissa* was added.<sup>5</sup> In regard to the modification of this

<sup>1</sup> Palmieri, *Op. Th. Mor.*, vol. vii. tr. xi. c. 4, n. 583 : 'Principia quaedam hac in re videntur a Doctoribus communiter plus minus admitti, scilicet. . . . Nemo tenetur delictum suum prodere quo sibi infamiam, aliis scandalum generat ; quapropter si crimen propter quod poena inflictæ est, sit occultum nemo ante sententiam (quæ hæc non haberet locum) ad id tenetur quo crimen suum manifestum fieret ; sed ad id solum teneri potest quod servari valeat absque criminis manifestatione.' Cf. etiam Suarez, *De Censuris*, disp. vi. sec. iii. n. 13 ; Wernz, *Jus. Decret.*, tom. vi. n. 63 ; D'Annibale, *Summul. Th. Mor.*, vol. i. n. 318 ; *Thesaurus*, De Poenis Eccles., pars. i. c. 28 and 29.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wernz, l.c. : D'Annibale, l.c. ; Palmieri, l.c.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. authors cited in preceding number.

<sup>4</sup> Wernz, l.c. nota 31 : 'In nonnullis poenis, hoc est ex natura rei, in aliis saltem ex consuetudine ita mitius propter allegatas rationes legem interpretante ; Lega, *De Judiciis Eccl.*, tom. iii. p. 119 ; D'Annibale, l.c. n. 315 ; Palmieri, l.c.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. authors already quoted.



expression by custom, claimed by some writers, Wernz wrote in the following strain :—

If it is said that custom has effected that the force of that clause is not admitted in practice, this fact of universal custom in all its generality or in regard to all punishments does not seem to be sufficiently proved, seeing that recourse is frequently made to the Sacred Penitentiary to obtain a dispensation, but at least on account of the authority of grave and learned writers that opinion seems to be probable and safe in practice.<sup>1</sup>

As to negative punishments which prevent the acquisition of rights, most writers maintained that the delinquent was bound without a declaratory sentence; a few, however, held the very contrary.<sup>2</sup>

From this brief review it can be seen how complex and how unsatisfactory was the old discipline in this matter, and what a relief it is now, both for the student and the practical missionary, to be able to fall back on the simple definite teaching of the Code. The general principle stated in Canon 2232, § 1, is that a *latae sententiae* punishment, whether medicinal or vindicative, binds *ipso facto* in both *fora* a delinquent who is conscious of his crime. As no distinction is made, the principle applies to positive as well as negative punishments—in fact there is no mention, either here or anywhere else, of this division of punishments. For the same reason it follows that the obligation exists prior to a declaratory sentence; and this is also evident from the exception which the canon makes immediately afterwards.

There is only one exception to the general principle. It is stated that before a declaratory sentence the delinquent is excused from the observance of the punishment whenever he cannot observe it without self-defamation. When will such a contingency arise? It seems to us that it can arise only when, in the case of a secret crime, it is impossible for the criminal to execute the punishment without betraying himself. Should the crime be public, or, even though it be secret, should it be possible to execute the punishment without self-defamation, the exception does not apply.

Professor Sole is somewhat misleading in his explanation of this exception. Deceived probably by the old teaching, he seems to hold that a criminal is nearly always excused from the observance of positive punishments and negative punishments which take away acquired rights, even though the crime is public. We shall give his words :—

In regard to positive punishments, everybody sees that the delinquent regularly cannot observe positive punishments without self-defamation. For the guilty person by placing the act necessary for the execution of the crime betrays himself. In regard also to negative punishments which take away acquired rights, such as benefice, office, patronage, etc.,

<sup>1</sup> I.e. nota 34.

<sup>2</sup> D'Annibale, l.c. : 'De his quae acquirendi capacitatem adimunt non satis convenit : nam quidam tenent nulla indigere sententia iudicis declaratoria ; alii contra putant. Mihi prior sententia videtur verior (a quo in foro externo vix recedimus, aut ne vix quidem), posterior tuta in conscientia.'

the same must also be said. For these punishments consist in the privation of a right, but they involve some fact of our own or of another, at least of omission, in order to be put into execution. . . . Therefore when there is question of punishments of this kind, whether positive or negative, which take away an acquired right, regularly the delinquent is excused from observing them before a declaratory sentence. But what of negative punishments which take away, not an acquired, but the juridical capacity of acquiring rights, e.g. the incapacity to acquire benefices? Really these punishments, which consist in the privation of a right involving no external possession of anything, can be executed without a fact of our own or another, and consequently, because they can be observed without self-defamation, the guilty person is bound to observe them even before a declaratory sentence.<sup>1</sup>

We think it must be quite clear that these distinctions cannot apply in the case of public crimes: in such circumstances the criminal has already lost his reputation, and so there can be no longer question of defamation. It may be, indeed, that the author intended them to apply only to occult crimes, but at best his comment is misleading. Furthermore we cannot agree with him in saying that negative punishments which prevent the acquisition of rights can always be executed without defamation. We have no difficulty in conceiving circumstances in which the observance of, for example, an incapacity to acquire a benefice would betray the criminal.

Although a *latae sententiae* punishment binds the delinquent in both *fora*, except in the circumstances mentioned, yet, the canon further states, in the external forum no one can demand its observance from him without a declaratory sentence, unless the crime is notorious. Hence, in the case of ordinary public crimes, although the delinquents are bound to observe the punishments, yet ecclesiastical superiors cannot in the external forum require them to do so by, for example, the infliction of other punishments, until a declaratory sentence has taken place.

From what has been said it will be clear to our correspondent that, so far as the necessity of a declaratory sentence is concerned, the old distinctions between positive and negative punishments and between those which prevent the acquisition of rights and those which take away rights already acquired no longer serve any useful purpose. One must admit, too, that, practically at any rate, the present is considerably more severe than the pre-Code discipline. Formerly, as we saw, on account of the probability of the various mild opinions, *latae sententiae* punishments, apart from censures, rarely imposed an obligation before a declaratory sentence. There is no difficulty, however, in admitting that in many places the new discipline is more strict than the old; even a cursory glance through the Code will make this evident.

<sup>1</sup> *De Delictis et Poenis*, n. 127.



## SOME POINTS IN CONNEXION WITH VICARS-GENERAL

REV. DEAR SIR,—Could you help a perplexed Professor by answering the following questions?

I. Reading the new Code of Canon Law I find (liber ii. De Personis, art. i. de Vicario-Generali, Can. 366, § 3) the following: 'Unus tantum (Vicarius-Generalis) constituatur, nisi vel rituum diversitas, vel amplitudo diocesis aliud exigat'; again (Can. 367, § 1), 'Vicarius-Generalis sit sacerdos e clero saeculari,' etc., and, lastly (Can. 367, § 2), 'Si diocesis alicui religioni commissa fuerit, Vicarius-Generalis potest esse eiusdem religionis alumnus.'

In what sense should these canons be interpreted? Suppose a diocese (which has neither 'diversitas rituum' nor 'amplitudo') with an almost equal number of religious and secular priests, and whose administration has been handed over to a religious Congregation; does the Codex mean that there can be two Vicars-General, one belonging to the secular clergy and the other to that religious Order? or does it mean that in such a diocese there should be only one Vicar-General, but that he may be a member of the Congregation in charge of the diocese?

II. Would a diocese with a total population of 368,000, of which 115,000 are Catholics—all belonging to the Latin rite—extending over 720 square miles, with excellent railway lines and roads, be of sufficient 'amplitudo' to justify the existence of two Vicars-Generals 'ex aequo' in it?

PERPLEXUS,

Clearly the second of the interpretations suggested by our correspondent is the correct one. The only reasons admitted in these canons for a plurality of Vicars-General are 'diversitas rituum' and 'amplitudo.' Where these do not exist only one Vicar-General may be appointed. The general rule, stated in Canon 367, § 1, is that the Vicar-General should belong to the secular clergy. To this Canon 367, § 2, makes an exception: when a diocese is committed to a religious institute—the proportion between the regular and secular clergy does not matter—the Vicar-General may be a member of the same institute, and of course, too, he may belong to the secular clergy. In the diocese contemplated, therefore, there can be only one Vicar-General, but he may be either a secular cleric or a member of the Congregation to which the diocese is committed.

Manifestly no hard and fast rule can be laid down as to the 'amplitudo' which would justify the constitution of a second Vicar-General. Much will have to be left to the judgment of the Bishop concerned. If he considers that, on account of its size, the ruling of the diocese would be considerably hampered by having merely one Vicar-General, he need have no scruple in appointing a second. It may very well be that such would be the case in the diocese described; we know of dioceses not very much larger in which the services of a second Vicar are found very useful; but again we must remind our correspondent that it is impossible to make any hard and fast rule.

J. KINANE.

## LITURGY

## THE 'ALLELUIA' AND PASCHAL TIME. REGISTRATION OF BAPTISM AND MARRIAGE. THE CERE-CLOTH ON AN ALTAR-STONE

REV. DEAR SIR,—1. In Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is Alleluia to be omitted after the 'Panem de coelo' from Low Sunday onwards or is the the full verse—'Panem de coelo praestitisti eis, alleluia'—to be said till Saturday after Pentecost?

2. In the Mass—High or Low—are the two Alleluias to cease at Low Sunday's Mass?

3. When a priest is giving simple Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, i.e. without Deacon or Sub-Deacon, is he allowed to wear the amice, or are surplice, stole and cope only allowed?

4. When the Bishop gives Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is the usual prayer '*Deus qui nobis*,' etc., to be chanted? Martinucci is silent on the point, although he mentions other things that the Bishop is to do; but De Amicis (in *Cerem. Parochorum* ii. p. 195) says expressly '*Episcopus surgit et consuetam orationem cantat.*' May this prayer be omitted?

5. (a) Does the new Code require an entry of baptism to be made in the register of the parish of the baptism or of the domicile, or of both? (b) Does it require an entry of marriage to be made in the register of the parish of the celebration or of the domicile or of both? (c) And in case the bride has only one month's residence in the place of marriage must an entry be made in the register of the place where she has resided from birth till a month before marriage or where her parents still reside?

6. May an altar-stone at Mass be covered with more than three cloths, e.g., the portable stones usually sewn into linen covers which probably were not blessed?

CLERICUS.

1. The Alleluia is prescribed to be added during Eastertide (*Tempus Paschale*), which begins with the Mass on Holy Saturday and ends after None and Mass on the Saturday after Pentecost Sunday. Throughout this time, as well as during the Octave of Corpus Christi, the Alleluia should be added to the Versicle and Response *Panem de coelo*, etc., at Benediction.<sup>1</sup>

2. In the *Introit* the two Alleluias are added during Eastertide, which does not end until the Saturday before Trinity Sunday; they are added to the *Ita missa est* only from Holy Saturday to the following Saturday (inclusive).

3. For solemn Benediction '*quando adsunt ministri Sacri parati*' the celebrant should wear amice, alb, cincture, stole and cope. For simple Benediction he may either wear surplice, stole and cope, or the vestments prescribed for solemn Benediction.<sup>2</sup> As to whether the amice

<sup>1</sup> Decr. 3983.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Van der Stappen, tom. iv. p. 187; *Cerem. Parochorum*, tom. i. p. 89.



may be worn with the surplice, stole and cope, though we do not find any express regulation to the contrary, we think that custom, which is decidedly against it, should be taken as an authoritative guide in the matter.

4. The Prayer should be said whether the Benediction is given by a Bishop or by a simple priest. Martinucci's silence is due to the fact that in this particular connexion he is concerned with the points of difference in the Service as performed by a Bishop rather than in outlining the complete ceremony; but in other places where the Bishop's functions are described in detail, he is quite clear upon the point. For instance, in describing the solemn Benediction by the Bishop on the occasion of the Solemnity of Corpus Christi, he says—'Cantato a cantoribus v. *Panem*, etc., cum responso *Omne delectamentum*, etc., assurget Episcopus, et e libro, quem a dextris ejus presentabit ei cappellanus stans, cantabit orationem *Oremus, Deus qui nobis*, etc., cum brevi responsione.'<sup>1</sup>

5. (a) According to Canon 777, § 1, an entry of the baptism is to be made in the baptismal register by the parish priest of the baptized, mentioning the name of the minister, the parents, and sponsors and the place and date of the baptism. Where the child is baptized in the parish of domicile there is no difficulty; the particulars are recorded in the parochial register either by the parish priest or by the priest whom he has delegated to take charge of the ceremony. The difficulty arises when the child is baptized in a parish other than the parish of domicile; when, in other words, the child is baptized '*nec a proprio paroco nec eo praesente*.' In which parish has the entry of baptism to be made, or should it be made in both? The Code (Can. 778) simply states that in such an event the minister of baptism should at once acquaint the parish priest of domicile of the fact of the baptism. As regards the entry in the register of the place of baptism, Can. 777, § 1, and the rubric of the Ritual leave no doubt about the matter. The Ritual (xxxii.) says—'Antequam infans ex Ecclesia asportetur aut susceptores discedant, eorum nomine, et alia de administrato Baptismo ad praescriptam formam in Baptismali libro Parochus accurate describat.' But does the obligation of notifying the parish priest of domicile imply also the correlative obligation on the part of the latter of entering the baptism with all the prescribed particulars in the baptismal register of his parish? Though we have not been able to elicit any information on the point from any of the recent commentaries on the Code, and should therefore hesitate to speak of an obligation in the case, we believe that the object of Canon 778 is that a record of the baptism should be kept also in the parish of domicile, and that the baptismal register is the proper place in which to record it. It may be said, of course, that it is very important that the parish priest should know that one of his subjects has been duly baptized—and hence the necessity of notifying him—but a record of the fact with all the details in the parish of domicile is also important and may save both him and his successors and the party concerned an amount of inconvenience in after years.

<sup>1</sup> Pars altera, vol. i. p. 668 (new edition).

Applications for baptismal certificates, for testimonies of age and parentage for marriage certificates, etc., though more properly directed to the place of baptism, will in the ordinary course come to the parish of origin, and if no record has been kept there, inconveniences and uncertainties are bound to arise. To say the least, therefore, we think it advisable and in accordance with the direction of the Code to have an entry of the baptism also in the parish of domicile.

(b) Canon 1103, § 1, prescribes that the parish priest of the place where the marriage is contracted—'vel qui ejus vices gerit'—should enter in his matrimonial register the various details of the marriage. If the marriage takes place outside the parish of domicile there is no obligation of having the marriage entered in the *Liber Matrimoniorum* of the parish or parishes to which the parties belong, though for reasons similar to those suggested in the previous question it would be useful to do so.

In addition the Code (Can. 1103, § 2) prescribes that an entry of the marriage be made in the *Liber Baptizatorum* of the parish or parishes, in which the parties were baptized. Opposite the name of each party in the baptismal register the parish priest is to note that he or she was married on such a date, and though it is not stated that the name of the other contracting party and the place of marriage should in each instance be mentioned, it would be useful for future reference to include these particulars. When a person has been married outside the parish in which he (or she) was baptized, the Code prescribes that the parish priest of the marriage shall send notice of the marriage to the parish priest of the place of baptism in order that the entry may be duly made in the baptismal register. The notice may be sent either directly or through the episcopal *curia*. If neither the baptism nor marriage has taken place in the parish of domicile no entry of the marriage is prescribed in the registers of that parish, though if, as we recommended in the previous question, there be an entry of the baptism in the register of the parish domicile, it would be desirable for similar reasons to note therein also the particulars of the marriage.

(c) The Code requires only that entries be made in the *Liber Matrimoniorum* of the place of marriage and in the *Liber Baptizatorum* of the place of baptism. If the baptism were also recorded in the register of the parish of parental domicile, it would be desirable to have the marriage likewise recorded therein.

6. Our correspondent has probably in mind the cere-cloth or Chrismal which is usually placed on the table of a fixed altar, and sometimes completely covers an altar-stone, to prevent the altar cloths from being stained by the sacred oils used in consecration and to intercept the humidity or dampness which form on the cold surface of the stone. It should be a white linen cloth reinforced by a covering of melted wax on the inner-side—hence cere-cloth (*cera*). It is an auxiliary to the three altar cloths—not a substitute for one of them, needs no blessing, and should not be removed from the table except at the stripping of the altar on Holy Thursday, or when it has to be washed or renewed.



## THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE CHILDREN OF MARY

An esteemed correspondent supplies the following additional information regarding the query on this subject which we answered in the June (1920) issue of the *I. E. RECORD* (pp. 502, 503). In our reply to the query we relied for the facts on the well-known authorities on the subject, viz., Beringer (vol. ii. pp. 212, 225), Maurel (*Indulgences*, pp. 230-236), and Ojetti (*Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, 'Congregationes B.M.V.'), and we consulted the opinion of some who have had experience in erecting and directing such Confraternities. A footnote in Maurel (6th Edition (1901) p. 236) throws some light on the point and inclines us to think that our correspondent is concerned with a more recent and more restricted Confraternity than the one we had under consideration. The footnote reads: 'Within the past few years there has been organized at Rome in the Basilica of St. Agnes—Outside the Walls—an Arch-Confraternity of the *Children of Mary*, under the patronage of the youthful Virgin Martyr. Sodalities or Confraternities of young females—*Children of Mary*—are at liberty to affiliate themselves to it, and thus to participate in the Indulgences with which it has been enriched by His Holiness Pius IX.'

HIGH STREET, ETON,  
17/9/20.

REV. DEAR SIR,—In a recent issue you kindly answered a query regarding the erection of Sodalities of the Children of Mary. May I be allowed to point out that aggregations may also be made to the *Primaria* Arch-Confraternity of Children of Mary—which has for its secondary patroness St. Agnes, whose tomb, in Rome (S. Agnese Outside the Walls), is the centre of this Confraternity. The conditions of aggregation are:

- 1°. That the Sodality be canonically erected by the Ordinary;
- 2°. That there be sent to Rome to the Abbot-General of the Canons Regular of the Lateran (S. Pietro in Vincoli, 4<sup>a</sup> Rome)—*not the Decree of erection*, but a letter signed by the Bishop giving his consent to the aggregation, which entitles the Sodality to the Indulgences and Privileges of the *Primaria*.

- 3°. A fee is charged of 5 lire.

I am, yours faithfully,

A. W. J. SMITH,  
Abbot, C.R.L.

## CONSECRATION OF FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS TO THE SACRED HEART AND THE APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly permit me to supplement the reply given under the heading of *Liturgy* in your June (1920) issue to a query regarding the Consecration of Families to the Sacred Heart.

In this reply you state that 'the founder of this devotion is Father Matthew Crawley-Boevey.' Pardon me if I say that this statement is not strictly accurate, except in so far as that Father Crawley-Boevey gave a new title to an already existing devotion of world-wide repute, dating

back to more than a quarter of a century earlier, and that he secured indulgences for its practice from the Holy See.

The following account of the origin of this devotion is taken in substance from the new edition of the *Handbook of the Apostleship of Prayer*, recently published by Father Aloysius Mazzella, S.J., nephew of the famous Cardinal Mazzella and Director for Italy of the Apostleship of Prayer. The practice of thus consecrating the home is based on the well-known Promise of Our Lord to St. Margaret Mary that He would bless the homes in which the image of His Sacred Heart should be exposed and honoured.

*Origin and History.*—It was the Apostleship of Prayer that first gave to this practice its present general and social character. As far back as the year 1875, Pope Pius IX took occasion from the fact that that year was the second centenary of the great Apparition of the Sacred Heart to St. Margaret Mary to consecrate the entire world to the Sacred Heart. To Père Ramière, S.J., Director of the Apostleship of Prayer, was entrusted the task of organizing the details of this consecration, and he made the consecration of the family to the Sacred Heart the basis of the work. In his circular to the Bishops of the Catholic world, Père Ramière wrote :—‘ We have every reason to hope that the most Loving Heart of Jesus will deny us no grace if on this solemn Anniversary of His Revelation the family be consecrated to His Sacred Heart by the head of the home, the Parish by its Priest, the Community by its Superior, and the Diocese by its Bishop.’ From that day on the consecration of families to the Sacred Heart has never ceased to be among the more important activities of the Apostleship of Prayer.

In 1882 this devotion received a further impulse through the zeal of Theodore Wibaux, a Jesuit Scholastic, then studying for the priesthood in Jersey, who before entering the Society had been a Pontifical Zouave. Wibaux devoted his vacations to the holy task of promoting among the Catholic population of Jersey the practice of consecrating their families to the Sacred Heart. His success was extraordinary, and an account of it, published in the *French Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, by Père Ramière, produced such a profound effect that the practice was taken up more enthusiastically than ever in France. The city of Marseilles became the centre of the movement in that country. The Very Rev. Canon Gastand, then Diocesan Director of the Apostleship of Prayer, took a leading part in promoting it, and by 1886 ten thousand families had in that one city alone consecrated themselves to the Sacred Heart. Henceforth the devotion advanced by leaps and bounds, not merely in France and Italy, but also in other parts of the world, especially in America. It was at that period that the Apostleship of Prayer, through its *Messenger*, more elaborately organized and spread the new devotion. A Register of Families was opened in 1889, in which, according to a contemporary periodical, were inscribed the names of over *two million families*.

Immediately before the celebration of the second centenary of the death of St. Margaret Mary Alacoque (October 15, 1890), Père Reynault, S.J., the new Director-General of the Apostleship of Prayer, sent thirty



volumes of names of families consecrated to the Sacred Heart to Paray-le-Monial, and seven more to Montmartre in Paris, where, at that time, the present beautiful church of the Sacred Heart was in course of erection. These books were entitled the 'Golden Books.' From this on, many millions of copies of the formula of Consecration of families were distributed through the medium of the Apostleship of Prayer.

Within recent years, in 1908, a fresh impetus was given to the movement, though on somewhat different lines, by the efforts of a zealous Peruvian priest, of English parentage, Father Matthew Crawley-Boevey. Beginning with the ceremony already in use, of placing a picture of the Sacred Heart in a prominent position in the house, Father Crawley-Boevey gave a new title to the work, namely, the 'Enthroning' of the Sacred Heart in the Home. The idea contained in this new title is an excellent one, suggesting, as it does, the formal invitation to Our Lord to make Himself the Sovereign Ruler and Master of the home. Nevertheless we understand that the Holy Father desires that the earlier title, *The Consecration of Families to the Sacred Heart*, should be retained, thereby focussing attention on the great central idea of the movement, namely, the *Consecration* of the family to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, rather than on the *Ceremony* that expresses and accompanies that Act.

*Allocution of Benedict XV.*—In an Allocution of Pope Benedict XV, delivered to the Promoters of the Apostleship of Prayer in Italy, [on June 22, 1919, His Holiness says :—' *We hope that the work of consecrations of families will belong especially to the Apostleship of Prayer : for to that body it owes its origin, and it should be connected with it, and be under its control.*' In another portion of the Allocution the Pope says :—' We have decided that all matters concerning such Consecration should be confided to the Society of Jesus, and this decision we have an opportunity of announcing now that the Society of Jesus has resumed, as its own special work, the Apostleship of Prayer in Italy.' Speaking of the Golden Books referred to above, the Pope continues :—' The Golden Books which are kept in the Church of Montmartre in Paris are too well known to need further mention. In the Monastery of Paray-le-Monial there are thirty volumes, in which are enrolled the names of 1,082,459 families, including not only French, but families of every nation which have devoted themselves to the Sacred Heart.'

*Progress in Ireland.*—Thus it will be seen that in Italy the work of promoting the Consecration of families belongs exclusively to the Apostleship of Prayer. The same is true of Poland. In other countries it is also largely, if not mainly, carried on by the Apostleship of Prayer. Thus in Ireland, for instance, since the summer of 1918, about 72,000 Certificates of the Consecration of the family have been issued from the Office of the *Irish Messenger of the Sacred Heart*. Allowing four persons to each family, this would mean the consecration of 288,000 persons. But as many families have been consecrated in connexion with the Apostleship of Prayer without getting Certificates, the number in reality is probably much greater. Moreover, at the invitation of the *Irish Messenger*, over 400 Colleges and Schools have recently been in a most solemn manner

consecrated to the Sacred Heart, the Consecration ceremony being in most cases performed by the parish priest, or one of the local clergy, in presence of all the pupils of the school. In some instances the number of pupils amounted to over 1,000. Taking as an average 300 pupils in each school—and this, I believe, is rather below than above the mark—the number of Irish boys and girls thus consecrated to the Sacred Heart would reach the high total of 120,000 in all. Finally, together with the names of these pupils, arranged under their various schools, I am sending to Paray-le-Monial, as part of Ireland's offering to the Sacred Heart, in connexion with the recent Canonization of St. Margaret Mary, five or six large volumes, which in all will contain not less than half a million of names.

From all this it will be seen : 1st, that the devotion of the Consecration of families to the Sacred Heart, or the ' Enthronement ' of the Sacred Heart in the home, as it has sometimes been called in recent years, dates back to the year 1875, or just 33 years previous to the time at which Father Matthew Crawley-Boevey again brought the matter before the Holy See ; 2nd, that from the outset the work of promoting this devotion was entrusted by the Pope to the *Apostleship of Prayer*, and that last year Pope Benedict XV reiterated the desire of Pius IX that the devotion should be promoted by this Association ; 3rd, that in 1908, through the zealous intervention of Father Crawley-Boevey, a fresh impetus was given to the work and indulgences secured for it ; 4th, that mainly through the action of the Irish Branch of the *Apostleship of Prayer*, the devotion has taken deep and wide-spread root in Ireland, where month after month its progress has been recorded in the pages of the *Irish Messenger of the Sacred Heart*.—I remain, Very Rev. and dear Father, yours sincerely,

JOSEPH McDONNELL, S.J.,

Editor of the *Irish Messenger of the Sacred Heart*.

P.S.—It should be noted that for the gaining of the indulgences mentioned above, the ceremony of Consecration must be performed by a priest in the home itself. The Ordinary of the Diocese has power to remit this as a necessary condition.<sup>1</sup> However, as an act of private devotion there is nothing to prevent the head of the family from consecrating his or her home to the Sacred Heart, without the presence of a priest. In this case it is desirable that the picture or image should be blessed by a priest.—J. McD.

We are grateful for this interesting communication from the pen of one whose efforts in popularizing this form of devotion to the Sacred Heart in the pages of the *Irish Messenger* are deserving of all praise and justly entitle him to speak with authority on the subject. The seeming discrepancy between Father McDonnell and ourselves as to the origin of the devotion is easily explained, for it is obviously due to a misunderstanding. If he will kindly read our reply again he will see

<sup>1</sup> Vide *Acta Apost. Sedis*, April, 1918, p. 154.



that we were concerned, not with the origin of the pious practice of consecrating families to the Sacred Heart, but with the 'ceremony which is technically known as the "Enthronement of the Sacred Heart in the Home."' Father McDonnell states truly that this was merely a stage in the development of an already existing devotion, but surely the idea of the 'Enthronement of the Sacred Heart' gave the devotion something more than a new title—added something substantial, something inspiring—just as the revelations to St. Margaret Mary gave zest, shape, and vigour to the already existing devotion to the Sacred Heart. Of this ceremony Father Matthew Crawley-Boevey was undoubtedly the 'Founder,' and largely through his instrumentality has already spread throughout the world. Through his efforts and those associated with him there are Centres for the propagation of the devotion established in England, Scotland, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and the United States, and International Secretariates in Paray-le-Monial (France), Paris, and Valparaiso (Chili). According to all the accounts of the devotion we have seen the idea of the 'Enthronement' originated with Father Crawley-Boevey, and his name is associated with it in the Roman documents sanctioning and approving of the devotion. He drew up the ceremonial which received the approval of Pius X and Benedict XV; it was through his intercession indulgences for the devotion were obtained from the Holy See; his work is frequently styled an Apostolate, and he received from Pius X and Benedict XV not merely a permission, but a solemn injunction to undertake it. In the Letter of approval of Cardinal Billot, S.J., whose authority is not less than that of Father Aloysius Mazzella, S.J., Father Crawley-Boevey is saluted as the Apostle and Founder of the 'Enthronement.' 'Once again,' he says, 'let us speak, aye, let us speak of the *Enthronement*, of which, Reverend Father, you have made yourself the Founder and Apostle.'

We had no mind to discuss the general question of the origin of the Consecration of Families to the Sacred Heart, or the excellent work, which is so well known, of the Apostleship of Prayer in that connexion. The promise made to St. Margaret Mary, viz., 'I will bestow My most abundant graces in the houses wherein My Heart shall be exposed and honoured,' once it received the supreme authority of the Church, manifestly accounted for the adoption of this form of devotion to the Sacred Heart. The idea of 'the Enthronement of the Sacred Heart in the Home,' formulated and promulgated for the first time by Father Crawley-Boevey in 1907, is nothing more, as Cardinal Billot says, than 'a simple and practical method for realizing the desires expressed to Blessed Margaret Mary.'

In our reply we stated that in order to qualify for the indulgences the picture should be blessed by a priest, but that 'the formal Act of Consecration, the installation of the picture and the recitation of the Prayer which follows, may be performed either by the priest or in his absence by the head of the family.' For

this we relied on the direction of the official Ceremonial, which we had before us. It says : ' We suggest the presence of the priest, but this is not indispensable. Even members of Catholic guilds and societies may themselves perform the Consecration of the homes they visit, provided that the priest, in the first instance, blesses the image.' On examination, however, we find that our copy of the Ceremonial,<sup>1</sup> which, inadvertently, we took to be authoritative and up-to-date, was issued in 1917. It has doubtless since then been worded to suit the prescription of the decree (dated 1st March, 1918) to which our correspondent refers. The question was asked : ' Quando judicandum sit, sacerdotem adesse non posse, ita ut imago SS. Cordis Jesu, prius benedicta, ab aliqua persona saeculari collocari et formula consecrationis recitari possit ? ' and the reply was : ' Judicium de hac re prudenti judicio Ordinarii loci remittitur.' It is well to note also that according to this decree, in order that the indulgences may be gained, the formula of Consecration sanctioned in the Rescript of 19th May, 1908, must be used. The formula of Consecration given in the Ceremonial above referred to is quite different from that of the Rescript.

M. EATON.

<sup>1</sup> Issued from the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Weymouth (1917).



# DOCUMENTS

## DECREE OF THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES REGARDING THE CUSTODY OF THE HEAD OF BLESSED OLIVER PLUNKET

(June 30, 1920)

[Permission is granted to His Eminence Cardinal Logue to have the sacred relic, heretofore preserved in the private chapel of the Dominican Nuns at Drogheda, transferred to the new parochial church in the same town, erected in view of the Beatification of the Martyr Primate.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

ARMACANA.

EŔME ET RŔME DOMINE MI OBSŔME,

Sanctissimus Dominus noster Benedictus Papa XV enixe rogatus, ut Apostolica Sua Auctoritate dirimere dignaretur questionem de capitis Martyris custodia, assumptis peculiaribus informationibus perpensisque peculiaribus adjunctis, per Decretum S.R.C. die Junii vertentis anni 1920, quaestionem propositam ita solvendam atque componendam statuit, ut, tradita aliqua reliquia Beati Oliverii Ep. et Mart. Sororibus S. Dominici, quae hucusque Sacrum depositum seu Caput ejusdem Beati in suo Sacello privato custodierunt apud conventum in civitate *Drogheda* Armacanae Archidioecesis existentem, ipsum Venerabile Caput in novam Ecclesiam parochialem ejusdem Civitatis, intuitu inclyti martyris Oliverii Plunket beatificationis, aedificatam, transferatur cum facultatibus necessariis et opportunis Eminentiae Vestrae hanc concessionem et translationem peragendi, etiam, si placet, per aliquem Sacerdotem in aliqua dignitate ecclesiastica, si fieri potest, constitutum et ab ipsamet Eminentia Vestra deputandum; servata tamen in omnibus Instructione apposite tradenda a R.P.D. Promotore generali Fidei.

Quum vero idem Fidei Promotor muneri sibi commissio satisfecerit, grave ne sit Eminentiae Vestrae rem omnem executioni demandandam curare.

Interim cum omni qua par est observantia manus Eminentiae Vestrae humillime deosculor.

Romae die 30 Junii 1920.

Humillimus et obsequentissimus servus verus

L. ✠ S.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufe.,  
*S.R.C. Praef.*

ALEXANDER VERDE, *S.R.C. Secretarius.*

EŔmo et RŔmo Domino,

Domino Cardinali Michaeli Logue,

Archiepiscopo Armacano, et Hiberniae Primato.

CIRCULAR LETTER FROM THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF  
RELIGIOUS TO ORDINARIES OF PLACES REGARDING THE  
RE-ELECTION TO THE OFFICES OF MOTHER-GENERAL IN  
RELIGIOUS CONGREGATIONS AND OF MOTHER SUPERIORESS  
IN CONVENTS

(March 9, 1920)

[In as far as the practice is against the Constitutions of the particular Congregation or Convent it is to be discouraged, and in each instance where 'for special and grave causes' the sanction of the Holy See for such re-election is postulated, the Ordinary is directed to state the reasons operating in the case, particulars regarding the votes recorded at the election, and finally his own opinion as to the merits of the request. The decree was published in September, 1920.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

LITTERAE CIRCULARES AD ORDINARIOS LOCORUM CIRCA EIUSDEM PERSONAE  
REPETITAM ELECTIONEM AD MUNUS MODERATRICIS GENERALIS IN  
CONGREGATIONIBUS RELIGIOSIS ET ANTISTITAE IN MONASTERIIS  
MONIALIUM

Ill<sup>me</sup> et Rev<sup>me</sup> Domine,

Saepissime accidit, ut Moderatrices generales Institutorum, quae ex praescripto suarum Constitutionum ad plurium annorum periodum eliguntur, et iterum ad idem munus immediate eligi queunt, tertio etiam et pluries, suffragio capitulari expetitae, opus habeant recurrendi ad H. S. C. de Religiosis pro debita facultate obtinenda.

Haec frequens regiminis protractio ultra tempus a Constitutionibus statutum aut permissum, minus opportuna videtur, praecipue cum ordinarie munus Moderatricis generalis ad sex annos duret, ex quo fit ut eadem persona, iterum electa, per duodecim annos continuos regimen legitime tenere queat. Si vero faciliter permittantur ultiores reelectiones, in cassum cedit finis Constitutionum, quae *ad tempus* regimen ab eadem persona in Instituto tenendum esse praescribunt, cui temporaneitati tota Constitutionum compago innititur. Hinc fit ut non raro, ex nimis protracto regimine unius eiusdemque personae, non parvi momenti incommoda et detrimenta Instituto proveniant. Nec valet quod in pluribus religiosarum Congregationum Constitutionibus expresse dicatur etiam *tertio* Moderatricem generalem posse eligi, dummodo duae tertiae partes suffragiorum eidem faveant. S. Sedis confirmatio accedat; hoc enim ita intelligendum est, ut si aliquando ob graves causas eadem persona tertio aut ulterius nominari debeat, hoc fieri nequeat nisi adsint illae duae conditiones. Hinc retinendum est quod in casu occurrit vera inhabilitas ad huiusmodi munus; quoties autem inhabilitas aliqua ex iure habetur, causae graves ad dispensationem requiruntur; unde simplex voluntas electorum aut idoneitas personae non est de se sufficiens ratio ad dispensationem obtinendam. Persona vero tali inhabilitate laborans non eligi sed postulari canonice debet.

Eadem sane animadvertenda sunt, servata debita proportione, circa electiones Abbatissarum, seu Antistitarum monialium, quibus per



Constitutionem Gregorii XIII prohibitum fuit quominus ultra triennium regimen monasterii haberent; quamvis vero in Codice Iuris Canonici haec praescriptio confirmata haud fuerit, tamen ex Summi Pontificis mandato H. S. C. in Constitutionibus monasteriorum eam servari praecipit. Cum tamen in monasteriis electio peragenda est intra Communitatis membra, quae saepe pauca sunt, facilius causa ad dispensationem haberi poterit, ex defectu scilicet idoneae personae.

Haec omnia revolvens animo SS<sup>m</sup>us D. N. Benedictus XV, ad praecavendos abusos, qui in hac re facile subrepere possunt, mandatum dedit monendi singulos Ordinarios locorum, quibus cura incumbit praesidendi electionibus sive Moderatricis generalis in capitulis Congregationum, sive Antistitarum in monasteriis monialium suae dioecesis, ut de praefata inhabilitate electrices doceant, et si quando certiores fiant capitulares in eandem personam ultra tempus a Constitutione permissum suffragium esse laturas, inquirant de specialibus et gravibus causis, quae postulationem exigere videantur, et moneant vocales Sedem Apostolicam difficilem omnino se praebere ad huiusmodi gratiam concedendam. Insuper noverint oportet, postulationem nonnisi perpensis mature causis admitti, quae proinde per litteras ab Ordinario ipsi Sanctae Sedi exponi debent. Quod sane non modicum tempus requirit et certum incommodum affert capitularibus, quae responsum expectare debent antequam ad ulteriora procedere possint.

Si quando tamen causae ita graves adsint, quae eiusdem personae electionem exigant ultra tempus in Constitutionibus permissum, Ordinarius, dispensationis obtinendae causa, petitionem ad Sacram Congregationem mittat, in qua clare et distincte referat, quot scrutiniis fuerit postulatio completa, quotve suffragia ex numero capitularium electaenaverint; praecipue rationes exponat quae talem relectionem exigere videantur, addita quoque sua sententia.

Interim omnia tibi fausta a Domino adprecor.

Romae, ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis, die 9 martii 1920.

THEODORUS CARD. VALFRÉ DI BONZO, *Praefectus*.  
MAURUS M. SERAFINI, Ab. O.S.B., *Secretarius*.

## DOUBTS REGARDING THE CEREMONIAL DRESS AND PRIVILEGES OF BISHOPS SOLVED BY THE CONGREGATION OF RITES

(July 9, 1920)

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM

### DUBIA

Repropositis dubiis in Decreto S. R. C. *De quibusdam Episcoporum privilegiis*, diei 26 novembris 1919 contentis (I, 5-IV, 1; *Acta Ap. Sedis*, an. 1920, n. 5); nimirum:

I.—Num usus mitrae argenteae cum laciniis item argenteis, pro simplici mitra damascena vel linea cum rubeis laciniis, sicubi ab aliquo Episcopo invectus fuerit tolerandus sit.

II.—Fierine debeat Episcoporum Missae solemnī pontificali adistentium, thurificatio statim ante incensationem presbyteri et diaconorum paratorum, qui Episcopo celebranti adstant ?

Et sacra rituum Congregatio, exquisito specialis Commissionis voto expositis dubiis ita respondendum censuit ;

Ad I : *Negative, iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. XVII, num. 1).

Ad II : *Servetur Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. I, cap. XXIII, nn. 27 et 28).

Atque ita rescipit et declaravit. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 9 iulii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,  
S.R.C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius*.

DECREE REGARDING THE BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, MARCELLINUS CHAMPAGNAT, MARIST PRIEST, AND FOUNDER OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE LITTLE BROTHERS OF MARY

(July 11, 1920)

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

LUGDUNEN.

BEATIFICATIONIS ET CANONIZATIONIS VEN. SERVI DEI MARCELLINI IOSEPHI BENEDICTI CHAMPAGNAT, SACERDOTIS MARISTAE ET INSTITUTORIS CONGREGATIONIS PARVULORUM FRATRUM MARIAE.

SUPER DUBIO

*An constet de virtutibus theolodalibus, Fide, Spe et Caritate in Deum et Proximum, nec non de cardinalibus, Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudine et Temperantia earumque adnexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad affectum, de quo agitur ?*

Servi Dei Marcellini Champagnat integram peragrandō aetatem, quae brevi potius unius et quinquaginta annorum conclusa fuit spatio, sedulo studioseque pervestiganti necessaria datum est invenire elementa, quibus conficiatur, christianas ab eodem Dei Famulo exercitas virtutes gradum illum, quem heroicum appellant, fuisse adeptas.

Hoc sane, quoddam veluti rei consecrarium, ex ea praesertim visum est descendere, qua praeditus venerabilis Marcellinus erat animi comparatione, ut ad perfectiora quaeque cogitanda, capessenda et executioni demandanda iugiter constanterque moveretur. Quumque ista inter perfectiora, ceu valde proclive est intelligere, pondere et gravitate sua exstarent ea atque eminent, quae ad peculiarem ipsius venerabilis Marcellini statum eiusque vitae institutum spectabant, factum exinde est, ut cunctis maxime, quae suae conditionis propria erant, perfunctus ille sit muneribus naviter sancteque ; ea nimirum contentione, perseverantia



et alacritate, quae aliorum sacerdotum aut religiosarum familiarum sodalium, etiam virtuose operantium, communem vivendi agendique praetergrediuntur modum; atque, hoc ipso, eam, qua nunc est opus, quaeque idcirco e proposito quaeritur, adstruunt manifestamque faciunt heroicarum virtutum probationem.

Revera, qui parumper animo reputaverit complexusque cogitatione fuerit quae nactus Dei Famulus sit temporum, locorum atque hominum adiuncta, facere profecto non poterit, quin venerabilem Marcellinum facile accenseat praeclaro illi sanctorum virorum agmini, quos dives in misericordia ideo excitasse visus est Deus, ut gravissima, quae non ita pridem immanis ille teterrimusque, octavodecimo exeunte saeculo, per Gallias desaeviens finitimasque regiones insectationis turbo religioni intulerat civilique reipublicae, valide curarentur vulnera et funditus sarcirentur damna. Magnum porro Lugdunense seminarium ingressus cum fuit Marcellinus, theologicis disciplinis operam daturus, alios inter, binos inibi, quadam non sine caelesti dispensatione, sortitus est condiscipulos; quorum unus Ioannes Baptista Vianney, qui, vix biennium, eum praeibat aetate; alter vero Ioannes Claudius Colin. Utque usu non raro venisse historia docet, brevi praefatos inter ephebos sanctaeque amicitiae foedere colligatos magna exorta est animorum coniunctio, eamque subsecuta quoque fuit mira consiliorum communio et societas, quorum id caput erat, ut, quantum in se haberent facultatis, totum assidue industrieque conferrent ad semetipsos parandos efficiendosque, quo magis fieri posset, minus indignos Christi Ecclesiaeque suae sacros administros. Quandoquidem tot immensitati ruinarum, quas ea cumlaverat, quae conquiescere tunc coeperat, adeo tristi celebritate insignis, universa publicarum rerum perturbatio et eversio, aptius consultiusque succurri nequiret, quam vitae christianae suprema instaurando principia, eisque minutam praecipue imbuendo plebem, maximeque catholicae fidei rudimentis erudiendo et informando teneras puerorum mentes.

Quo autem hisce, quae tam digna tamque temporis accommodata proposuerant sibi, large copioseque benediceret Deus, augustam Eiusdem Genetricem rati iure meritoque fuerunt praesentissimam sibi adhibendam esse conciliatricem; eapropter, suasore etiam seminarii rectore, qui eisdem se dedit itineris socium, ad Mariale sanctuarium, vulgo *de Fourvière*, quod ea in regione et circum magno habebatur et habetur in honore, sunt peregrinati. Neque incassum fusae tunc fuerunt preces; has namque tanta ubertate fortunare dignatus est Deus, quantam qui proxime sunt subsecuti, amplissime ostenderunt eventus. Ephebus quippe ille Ioannes Baptista Vianney idem profecto est ac *Beatus Parochus vici Ars*; isto enim potius quam suimet proprio cunctis ipse evasit pernotus nomine; ob perarduum siquidem ab eo ad exemplum gestum curionis munus, nihil universo christiano populo iucundius et fructuosius procul dubio accideret, quam si eius Canonizationis causa fausto celerique gressu peroptatam suam maturaret metam. Ephebus vero alter Ioannes Claudius Colin idem et ipse est ac venerabilis Dei Servus *Ioannes Claudius Colin*, cuius nempe duodecim ante annos apud sacram rituum Congregationem inita quum fuerit Beatificationis causa,

inceptum nunc suum ipsa prosequitur cursum ; quodque insuper minime est praetereundum, peculiari immo est notatione dignum, idem venerabilis Colin bene meritissimam instituit Congregationem *Societatis Mariae*, quae, prae ceteris, duobus magnopere suis gloriatur alumniis ; Beato videlicet *Petro Aloisio Maria Chanel*, Oceaniae protomartyre, cuius pariter reassumptio obtenta est causae Canonizationis, et magni Lugdunensis seminarii olim ephebo simulque Beati Parochi vici Ars et venerabilis Colin condiscipulo, ad quem pertinet hodiernum hoc apostolicum Decretum : venerabili scilicet Marcellino Iosepho Benedicto Champagnat. Hic sane, qui venerabilis Colin lateri semper adstiterat eumque mirum in modum adiuverat in Congregatione fundanda Societatis Mariae, totus in eo postmodum fuit, ut, eodem probante et suadente Patre Colin, novam congregaret familiam *Parvorum Fratrum Mariae*, quippe qui laici quum essent cunctisque proinde soluti, quae secum ferant oportet sacerdotalia munia, liberius, constantius planeque unice vocationi suae, quae in una dumtaxat christiana puerorum institutione sita esse deberet, intendere possent. Neque in hoc venerabilem Dei Famulum vel minime falsum fuisse opinione sua, quum cetera deessent, insigni praeclaroque documento exstat mirifica novi Sodalitii propagatio, utpote quod, veluti sinapis granum, exiguo temporis fluxu, uberrimam adolevit in segetem suosque ad universum fere orbem opimos protulit fructus.

Cuncta haec plenam in lucem proferenda curarunt actores, cum super heroicis venerabilis Marcellini virtutibus, abhinc decennium, institutum impigre strenueque persecuti sunt iudicium, quodque tribus de more disceptationibus licuit absolvere ; binas quippe, quae praehabitae iam fuerant, congregationes, anteparaeparatoriam nempe et praeparaeparatoriam, subsecuta est Congregatio generalis, quae, die vigesima secunda superioris mensis iunii, coram sanctissimo Domino nostro Benedicto Papa XV coacta fuit, in qua a Reverendissimo Cardinali Ianuario Granito Pignatelli ni Belmonte, causae Relatore, sequens ad discutiendum propositum est dubium : *An constet de virtutibus theologalibus, Fide, Spe et Caritate in Deum et Proximum, nec non de cardinalibus, Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudine ac Temperantia earumque adnexis venerabilis Servi Dei Marcellini Iosephi Benedicti Champagnat, in gradu heroico, in casu et ad effectum, de quo agitur ?* Reverendissimi Cardinales et Patres Consultores sua quisque ex ordine suffragia ediderunt, quibus tamen laeto intentoque animo exceptis et perpensis, Sanctissimus Dominus noster iudicium Sibi prorogandum duxit, cunctisque qui aderant interim indixit preces ad caeleste lumen implorandum. Quod quidem praestitum quum fuerit, supremam Suam statuit edicere sententiam hodierna die Dominica VII post Pentecosten ; ideoque, Sacro devotissime peracto, ad Vaticanas Aedes arcessiri voluit Reverendissimos Cardinales Antonium Vico, Episcopum Portuensem et S. Rufinae, sacrae rituum Congregationi Praefectum, et Ianuarium Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte, Episcopum Albanensem, causaeque Relatorem, una cum R. P. Angelo Mariani, Fidei Promotore generali, meque insimul infrascripto Secretario, eisque, adstantibus, solemniter pronuntiavit : *Constare de virtutibus theologalibus,*



*Fide, Spe et Caritate in Deum et Proximum, necnon de cardinalibus, Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudine ac Temperantia earumque adnexis venerabilis Servi Dei Marcellini Iosephi Benedicti Champagnat, in gradu heroico, in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*

Hoc Decretum publici iuris fieri et in acta sacrorum rituum Congregationis referri mandavit, quinto idus iulias anno MCMXX.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,  
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius.*

DECREE DECLARING THE BEATIFICATION OF MARIA MAGDALEN FONTAINE AND HER THREE ASSOCIATES OF THE INSTITUTE OF THE SISTERS OF CHARITY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, AND OF MARIA CLOTILDES ANGELA AND HER TEN COMPANIONS OF THE URSULINE NUNS OF VALENCIA

(June 13, 1920)

#### LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

VENERABILES SERVAE DEI MARIA MAGDALENA FONTAINE ET TRES EIUS SOCIAE, EX INSTITUTO PUELLARUM CARITATIS SANCTI VINCENTII A PAULO, NECNON MARIA CLOTILDES ANGELA A SANCTO FRANCISCO BORGIA ET DECEM EIUS SOCIAE, E MONIALIBUS URSULINIS DE VALENCIENNES, AD BEATORUM CAELITUM HONORES EVEHUNTUR.

#### BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Martyrum rigata sanguine vel ab ipsis suis primordiis Ecclesia Dei, exhibere postea ad nostra usque tempora nunquam destitit miranda exempla fortitudinis. Id evenit etiam in immani illa impiaque seditione quae, saeculo XVIII iam ad finem vergente, Galliam universam per nefas exagitavit, avitamque illius praenobilis regionis fidem penitus extinguere molita est. Etenim, ea grassante seditione, ad sempiternum Ecclesiae decus renovatae quidem sunt martyrum coronae et palmae et sacrae Deo virgines, veterum fidei adsertorum facinora aemulae, atrocissima quaeque pro Christo pati ipsamque cruentam vitae iacturam facere non dubitarunt.—Has inter, quindecim accensentur Virgines, quarum priores quatuor ad Societatem pertinent Puellarum a Caritate, nimirum sorores Maria Magdalena Fontaine, Maria Francisca Lanel, Teresia Fantou et Ioënnæ Gérard; undecim vero religiosae ex Ordine sunt Monialium Ursularum, eaeque nomen habent Maria Clotildes a sancto Francisco Borgia, Maria Scholastica a sancto Iacobo, Anna Iosephina, Maria Ursula a sancto Bernardino, Maria Aloisia a sancto Francisco Assisiensi, Maria Laurentina a sancto Stanislao, Maria Augustina a sacro Corde Iesu, Maria Natalia a sancto Aloisio, Anna Maria, Maria Francisca et Maria Cordula a sancto Dominico. Harum primae quatuor in civitate Cameracensi, alterae vero Valencenis in

catholicae fidei odium capitis damnatae, alacri libentique animo supplicium perpressae sunt. Quamvis cum de martyribus agatur 'sola mors sit in qua residet heroicitas' ideoque necessarium non sit 'vitam ante actam inquirere,' expedit tamen paucis verbis et summætim quasi delibare vitam harum christianarum heroidum, ut ex operibus fides earum agnoscat. Quod attinet ad quatuor Puellas a Caritate, illis id sane obtigerat ex auspicio, ut Atrebatensi in urbe eandem illam religiosam domum incolerent, quam in vivis adhuc agentes et operantes sanctus Vincentius a Paulo et eius dilecta discipula vitaeque spiritualis filia Lodovica de Marillac erigendam curaverant. Piae communitati praeerat Maria Magdalena Fontaine, quae, adhuc adolescentula in Institutum Puellarum Caritatis cooptata, eos fecerat in virtute progressus ut domui regendae fuerit praeposita, quo in munere singularem prudentiam cum religiosa regularum observantia sociatam ostendisse constat. Imminente enim teterrima procella, sodales iuniores, magis periculo obnoxias, ad proprias familias iussit remeare vel ad exterarum nationes confugere; ipsa cum tribus probatis sororibus mansit Atrebat. Hae laborum et gloriosae passionis sociae fuerunt Maria Francisca Lanel, Maria Teresa Fantou et Ioanna Gérard, omnes in Gallia ortae et Instituti Caritatis benemerentissimae filiae, quae, non minus atque Antistita, tam legiferi Patris Vincentii a Paulo, quam Ordinis confundatricis Lodovicae genuinum nativumque hauserant spiritum. Et sane, licet inter civiles tumultus et pericula impendentia, nihil ipsae remisere de curis ac solatiis quae egenis atque aegrotis adhibere consueverant, immo constantius et alacrius inter omne genus asperitates in hoc praecipuo ipsarum professionis munere insistere perrexerunt. Monitae ut propriae saluti consulerent atque in tutiorem locum se reciperent, ne pauperes desererent, constanter recusarunt: donec semel iterumque id impositum eis fuit, quod incolumi conscientie salvisque religionis iuribus se praestare non posse pro comperto hebeant. Adactae ad iusiurandum quod libertatis et aequalitatis vocabatur, impavidae virgines flecti nescio pectore illud detrectarunt, ideoque in vincula coniectae, in publicos carceres detrusae sunt. Cameracensem in civitatem reductae, dum in custodia degunt, in levamen et solatium concaptivorum caritatis apostolatam exercent. In iudicium raptae ac de iuramento praestando denuo atque instantè rogatae, veterum martyrum constantiam praeseferentes, denegarunt iugiter; eaque de causa capite damnantur. Continuo de his supplicium sumptum. Euntes ad mortem Rosarium et Laudes Virginis recitabant, et, quasi triumphum agerent, caelesti iucunditate perfusae, hymnum 'Ave, maris stella' concinebant. Altera post alteram securi percussae, ad caelestis Sponsi complexum convolarunt; ultima letale pegma conscendit Antistita Maria Magdalena Fontaine. Haec, antequam securi submitteret caput, insigne protulit vaticinium; nempe se suasque sodales ultimas fore hostias patibuli, nuntiavit adstanti populo; et vaticinium probavit eventus. Religiosae enim ipsae sorores, novissimae revera fuerunt dirissimae illius insectationis victimae in urbe Cameracensi. Extremum hoc Puellarum Caritatis supplicium consummatum est die XXVI mensis iunii anno MDCCXCIV. —Quod si mentem convertamus ad Virgines Ursulinas, quae, eadem



seditione debacchante, Valencenis martyrium fecerunt, haud minus insignia christianae virtutis et constantiae exempla invenimus. Clotildes Iosepha Paillot, septem ac viginti annos nata, quum Ursularum Valencenis asceterium ingressa est, in religione nomen assumpsit Mariae Clotildis Angelae a sancto Francisco Borgia et regulare vitae genus exorsa, tantam consorum aestimationem fiduciamque sibi conciliavit brevi, ut ad Sodalitatem moderandam eligeretur. Proditum memoriae est commissi sibi muneris partes ipsam angelica dulcedine implevisse, simulque adeo virtutum laude praestitisse, ut non modo omnibus esset carissima, sed etiam tamquam exemplum respiceretur. Prudentia cum animi lenitate sociata praecipue enituit, effectique ut in sua religiosa familia regularis observantia ad amussim servaretur. Neque minus excelluit in puellis instituendis, quarum plures ab ea educatae, vel rectissimam vitae rationem servarunt, vel Deo virgineum florem voverunt. Maria Margarita Iosepha Leroux, cum asceterium ingressa est, Mariae Scholasticae a sancto Iacobo nomen assumpsit et pietatis studio non minus quam literarum laude et manuum labore praestitit. Huius germana soror Anna Iosepha Leroux, etsi vota nuncupavit religiosa in conventu Urbanistarum a sancta Clara, iure tamen inter Ursulinas virgines in odium fidei interfectas recensetur. Everso enim Clarissarum coenobio, Valencenas venit, ut, Ursularum veste induta, gloriosam pro fide mortem oppeteret. Hyacintha Augustina Gabriella Bourla, cui religionis nomen inditum fuit Mariae Ursulae a sancto Bernardino, ita semper se gessit, ut angelus in terris videretur ob singulare potissimum puritatis et humilitatis studium. Maria Genovefa Iosepha Ducrez, in religione vocata Maria Aloisia a sancta Francisco Assisiensi, nitidum regularis vitae exemplar habita usque fuit. Ioanna Regina Prin, scilicet in religione Maria Laurentina a sancto Stanislao, licet infirma valetudine devexata, nec caritatis fervorem imminuit, neque aliquid unquam de suis officiis praetermisit. Sollers ludi magistra, pia puellarum institutioni diligentissime vacavit. Maria Magdalena Iosepha Dejardin, quam in religione Mariam Augustinam a sacro Corde Iesu appellabant, Ursularum vestem, quam sumpserat, ad mortem usque fideliter servavit, neque illam voluit demittere cum nefaria lex suppressionis claustrorum edita est. Ingenio fuit fervido, martyriique desiderio adeo exarsit, ut vel brevissima expectatio nimis longa ei visa sit. Maria Aloisia Iosepha Vanot, in religione vocata Maria Natalia a sancto Aloisio, in regularum perfectissima observantia vitam transegit, et familiarum, quae pueros ipsi committebant instituendos, benevolentiam atque existimationem promeruit, ob studiosissimam curam qua eorumdem educationi advigilabat. Maria Augustina Erraux, in religione Anna Maria, incensissima in Deum caritate enituit, alumnosque suos ad amorem Domini verbo excitavit atque exemplo. Maria Lievina Lacroix, cui nomen in religione fuit Mariae Franciscæ, ad perfectiorem vitam divinitus vocata, primum inter Birgittinas moniales emissis votis cooptata est; dein, monasticis Ordinibus eversis, Valenceniensibus Ursulinis sese adiunxit, easque ad gloriosam usque mortem sequuta est. Denique Ioanna Aloisia Barré, in coenobio Maria Cordula a sancto Dominico nuncupata, tamquam soror conversa inter Ursulinas adlecta, antistitam

dilectissimam sororesque suas ne relinqueret, voluit cum illis pretiosam mortem obire. Hae decem sorores, etiam ipsae omnes in Gallia natae, sub disciplina Antistitae Mariae Clotildis Angelae a sancto Francisco Borgia, in asceterio a sancta Ursula civitatis Valencenarum, quod religionis ingressu animose arripuerant christianae perfectionis iter, contentione summa, summaque alacritate prosequi nitebantur. Inter praecipua ipsarum professionis officia illud erat, ut christiana catechesi atque educatione erudirent et informarent pueros e populo ac praesertim puellas. Munus huiusmodi, quo sororibus ipsis laboriosius et universo hominum convictui fructuosius, vix vesana illa conflagravit seditio eo magis Christo nominis osorum iram id sacras Deo virgines excitavit. Quare primum in odium fidei e claustris deturbatae et in exilium pulsae, cum, recuperata ab Austriacis copiis urbe Valencenarum, quasi ad optatum portum, ad suum asceterium Ursulinae virgines remeassent, paucos post menses, expugnata a factiosis Reipublicae turmis civitate, pulsisque Austriacis, denuo in impiorum manus religiosae sorores ceciderunt. Una cum Antistita in carcerem coniectae sub falso emigrationis praetextu, capite damnantur. Ipsarum Antistita Maria Clotildes Angela, interrita in conspectu mortis, interrogantibus iudicibus, responsa dedit digna martyre prisco: nimirum usa est illa lingua qua veteres fidei adsertores utebantur, secundum divinam illam promissionem: 'Dabitur enim vobis in illa hora quid loquamini' (Matth., X, 19). Primae ad supplicium adductae sunt quinque Moniales, nempe Maria Natalia Vanot, Maria Laurentina Prin, Maria Ursula Bourla, Maria Aloisia Ducrez et Maria Augustina Dejardin, quae, psalmum 'Miserere' recitantes, patibulum adscenderunt. Quo desiderio martyrii palmam inhiarent ex hoc argui potest, quod soror Dejardin celeri pede gradus pegmatis conscendere connixa est, ut socias anteiret in morte; sed consororis questu et carnificis iussu ad servandum ordinem adstricta est. Hae quinque virgines die xvii mensis octobris anno mdccxciv martyrium fecerunt. Aliae quinque supererant una cum Antistita Maria Clotilde Paillot sorores, videlicet Iosephina Leroux, Maria Leroux, Francisca Lacroix, Anna Maria Erraux et Maria Cordula Barré. Hae, paucos post dies, idest die vicesimo tertio eiusdem mensis et anni, capite plectendae traduntur carnifici; et, ne profana manus sacras Deo virgines foedaret, propriis manibus absciderunt comas, nudaruntque colla securi percutienda. A pia Antistita confirmatae ad mortem pro Christo sancte oppetendam ac dulci spe erectae ad expectatas caelestis Sponsi nuptias convolandi, Ambrosianum hymnum et Litanias Virginis concinentes, ad patibulum processerunt, adstante populo ipsisque tortoribus tantam fortitudinem demirantibus. Divini Salvatoris exemplum sequutae, qui in Calvariae vertice iam Cruci defixus ignovit interfectorebus suis, antequam caput obtruncandum traderent carnifici, illius manus osculari non horruerunt. Brevi interemptae, cum palma victoriae priori sociarum agmini adiunctae sunt. Post pretiosam hanc piarum virginum in conspectu Domini mortem, quae ut ait sanctus Cyprianus: 'emit immortalitatem pretio sanguinis et accepit coronam de consummatione virtutis' invaluit in populum fama martyrii. Ursulinarum virginum non minus quam puellarum a Caritate caedes etiam



a gravibus rerum gestarum scriptoribus verum ac formale martyrium appellata est, ipsaeque tamquam Christi martyres in odium fidei peremptae haberi coeptae sunt ac recoili. Quare de Beatorum Martyrum honoribus ipsis tribuendis Causa agitari coepta est penes Sacrorum Rituum Congregationem et in Curia Cameracensis Diocesis, cuius intra fines duplex virginum agmen coronam obtinuerat; processus ordinarii adornati sunt, omnibusque rei momentis mature perpensis, r. m. Pius Pp. X. Decessor Noster, die XXIX mensis maii anno MCMVII introductionis Causae decretum obsignavit. Continuo proposita quaestio est de martyrio, martyriique causa, et cum post quadruplicem disceptationem constiterit quindecim harum piarum virginum internecionem apprime evenisse in odium christiani nominis et solam fidem fuisse illius causam, Nos, sollemni decreto, pridie nonas iulias anno MCMXIX edito, de martyrio et causa martyrii venerabilium famularum Dei Mariae Magdalenae Fontaine et trium Sociarum eius, nec non Mariae Clotildis Angelae a sancto Francisco Borgia et decem Sociarum eius constare declaravimus. Illud quidem obtigit ex auspiciato, ut hoc decretum declarationis martyrii quatuor Puellarum Caritatis illo ipso die in lucem prodiret, quo aliud promulgabatur decretum de Beatorum caelitum honoribus Instituti Puellarum Caritatis confundatrici, venerabili ancillae Dei Lodovicae de Marillac tuto tribuendis. Super signis sive miraculis dispensatum est. Cum igitur de martyrio constaret, illud supererat, ut Sacrorum Rituum Cardinales et Consultores rogarentur an, stante approbatione martyrii martyriique causae, nec non dispensatione a signis seu miraculis, tuto procedi posse censerent ad sollemnem earundem servarum Dei Beatificationem. Hoc praestitit Venerabilis Frater Noster Vincentius Cardinalis Vannutelli, Episcopus Ostiensis et Praenestinus, Sacri Conlegii Decanus, Causae Relator, in generalibus Comitiis, coram Nobis in Vaticanis aedibus habitis, die secundo mensis decembris, anni superioris; omnesque tum Reverendissimi Cardinales, tum qui aderant Patres Consultores unanimi consensu 'affirmative' responderunt. Nos tamen in tanti momenti re Nostram aperire mentem distulimus, donec a Patre luminum caelestis sapientiae auxilium impetraremus. Quod cum impensis precibus fecissemus, tandem pridie kalendas martias vertentis anni, nempe secunda Dominica Quadragesimae Eucharistico Sacro rite litato accitis adstantibusque VV. FF. NN. Antonio S. R. E. Cardinali Vico, Episcopo Portuensi et sancta Rufinae, SS. Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, et Vincentio S. R. C. Cardinali Vannutelli, Episcopo Ostiensi et Praenestino, Sacri Conlegii Decano et Causae Relatore, una cum dilectis filiis Angelo Mariani, Fidei Promotore generali, nec non Alexandro Verde, eiusdem SS. Rituum Congregationis Secretario, sollemniter ediximus tuto procedi posse ad sollemnem enunciatarum famularum Dei Beatificationem. Quae cum ita sint. Nos precibus etiam permoti tum Missionariorum sancti Vincentii a Paulo et Puellarum a Caritate, tum universae Congregationis Monialium a sancta Ursula, Apostolica Nostra Auctoritate, praesentium vi, facultatem facimus ut venerabiles ancillae Dei Maria Magdalena Fontaine ac tres Sociae eius, nempe Maria Francisca Lanel, Francisca Fautou et Ioanna Gérard e Congregatione Puellarum Caritatis,

nec non Maria Clotildes Angela a sancto Francisco Borgia ac decem ipsius Sociae, videlicet Maria Scholastica a sancto Iacobo, Anna Iosephina, Maria Ursula a sancto Bernardino, Maria Aloisia a sancto Francisco Assisiensi, Maria Laurentina a sancto Stannislao, Maria Augustina a sacro Corde Iesu, Maria Natalia a sancto Aloisio, Anna Maria, Maria Francisca et Maria Cordula a sancto Dominico sanctimoniales a sancta Ursula, Beatae in posterum appellentur, earumque corpora et reliquiae, non tamen in sollemnibus supplicationibus deferendae, publicae fidelium venerationi proponantur atque imagines radiis decorentur. Insuper eadem auctoritate Nostra concedimus, ut de illis recitetur Officium et Missa de Communi Martyrum iuxta rubricas Missalis et Breviarii Romani. Eiusmodi vero Officii recitationem et Missae celebrationem fieri dumtaxat concedimus, ad beatas Puellas a Caritate quod attinet, in dioecesibus Cameracensi et Atrebatensi itemque in iis ubi ipsae natae sunt, nec non in omnibus templis ac domibus ubique terrarum sitis, quae pertineant ad Missionarios Vincentianos et Puellas a Caritate, atque etiam in locis ubi eadem virgines sua munera impleant, quod vero ad beatas Moniales a Sancta Ursula, in dioecesi Cameracensi et domibus ac templis Monialium a S. Ursula, ab omnibus fidelibus tam saecularibus, quam regularibus, qui horas canonicas recitare teneantur; et quod ad Missas attinet, a Sacerdotibus confluentibus ad templa in quibus Beatarum ipsarum festum celebretur. Denique largimur, ut sollemnia Beatificationis earundem famularum Dei peragantur cum Officio et Missa duplicis maioris ritus, idque fieri concedimus in praedictis dioecesibus et in templis seu oratoriis quae nominavimus, die per Ordinarium designando, inter annum postquam eadem sollemnia in Patriarchali Basilica Vaticana fuerint celebrata. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis nec non Decretis de non cultu editis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque. Volumus autem ut harum Litterarum exemplis, etiam impressis, dummodo manu Secretarii Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis subscripta et Praefecti sigillo munita sint, in disceptationibus etiam iudicialibus eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae Nostrae voluntatis significationi, his ostensis Litteris, haberetur.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIII mensis iunii anno MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status.*



# REVIEWS AND NOTES

GOOD SHEPHERD CHRONICLES. I. The First Convent of the Good Shepherd in England, and its Superior, Mother Mary of St. Joseph Regaudiat. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.

THIS chapter in the history of the Good Shepherd Order is a beautiful example of the triumph of the weak and lowly. It began in prayer and in the answer to prayer. It was clearly providential. Up to the year 1840, there was no convent of the Good Shepherds in England, and entreaties were sent from London to Angers to have some Sisters sent to begin a foundation. Two started out, with no knowledge of English or of London, with £40 in their pockets. That was their whole stock-in-trade to set up a charitable institution. It seemed ludicrous and to court disaster. Indeed disaster was dogging their footsteps after ceaseless journeyings about London in slush and rain looking for a cheap house. It was prayer that brought them material help. Bishop Griffiths called one day to see the two dejected Sisters, and told them he had a lawsuit depending on arbitration. 'Now, if by your prayers you can obtain success for me,' he said, 'I will give you a thousand pounds to begin your work of charity.' A novena was commenced with great earnestness, and before the end of it the cause was decided in favour of the London diocese.

A house was obtained by the Sisters in King Street, Hammersmith, on a lease of two years and two months. Their furniture and possessions consisted of two little deal bedsteads, the mattresses for which they themselves had made, two trunks, a chest of drawers, a table, two chairs, some coarse linen, a coffee pot, a few plates, and a frying-pan. These were the small beginnings—or no beginnings at all—of the foundation afterwards transferred to Beauchamp Lodge where, from year to year, new edifices arose. It was a foundation sown in tears, beset with obstacles, and hedged with thorns, yet it blossomed into a rich harvest for souls. Thieves broke into their house in King Street, looking for spoils. Bigotry hampered their quiet life and their early endeavours. On one side of them was a school for the orphan daughters of clergymen of evangelical 'principles,' and on the other was a dogs' home. A home for penitents was a most disgraceful thing beside these two respectable institutions. What between the massive dogs sent running riot in the Sisters' garden and the evangelicals objecting to laughter and singing on Sunday, the poor Sisters were tormented sorely. But perseverance, patience, courage, and confidence in God Mother Regaudiat

had early learnt, and now it secured her triumph over bigotry and opposition. The House soon won favour even from the Criminal Courts, and before the lease of King Street was out, twenty-five 'children' had found a secured shelter from the cruel world. Rescue work in England was at that time a novelty. Curiosity brought friends to this modest foundation. Many quaint stories, written with the humour of a Dickens, tell of the simple souls who brought their little mite to the poor Sisters. A friend brought them one day, in a lawyer's bag, some charcoal and a pair of bellows, lest they should be disappointed in having Benediction. The whole book is full of these quaint anecdotes that give a piquancy to a very pathetic, and, at the same time, a very cheerful narrative, for joy and hope seemed to be the golden links that bound the Sisters through difficulty and discomfort to a seemingly hopeless mission. It was indeed an immense task, on such a small fortune, for the Sisters to house so many 'children,' educate them in faith and morals, train them in needle-work, and then find a market for their work. It was solely on the work of the needle they kept the foundation together. But it was to the master-mind and the ardent and saintly soul of Mother Regaudiat that the whole success was due, and that to-day the Good Shepherd Order in England is so flourishing, and such an untold blessing to the English community.

The book is a simple story, but it is full of pathos, humour, and a peculiar charm that make it, apart from its local and historical aspect, delightful reading and deeply interesting to those who follow in the way of the 'Good Shepherd.'

M. R.

ON THE MORALS OF TO-DAY. By Rev. Thomas Slater, S.J. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.

THE short papers that compose this neat little volume are not all of a piece, as their titles will show : The Morality of Anti-conceptive Devices ; The Short Form of Extreme Unction ; Affinity and the New Code ; The New Code and the *Impedimentum Criminis* ; False Accusation of Solicitation and the New Code ; The New Code and the *Impedimentum Disparitatis Cultus* ; Socialists, Christ, and the Church ; The Profiteering Act, 1919 ; Strike Ethics. Some of the papers, no doubt, have been included to give them permanent form. They are all on live topics and are of exceptional interest to-day to priests.

The very difficult and delicate problems connected with sex morality are being openly discussed in the daily and weekly press, and the public are invited to form their own opinions on the questions raised. The writers, knowing well on which side popular sentiment is likely to be found, naturally adopt a tone and maintain views that will be acceptable to the majority of their readers. It is well, then, for priests to be thoroughly acquainted with the whole subject, so that their influence may be more effective. This is all the more necessary now since a regular propaganda has been undertaken by the Neo-Malthusian League to spread



'a universal knowledge of hygienic contra-conceptive devices among adult men and women.' Open-air meetings have been held in towns to disseminate these views, and a special pamphlet is being distributed gratuitously. The insidious plea in all this is that small families and a falling birth-rate are not only not evil, but that they are a positive good, and represent an evolutionary rise in nature and a higher stage in civilization. It is patently evident that the whole plea is thoroughly unscientific, immoral, and disastrous to nations. The whole question is discussed by Father Slater in its moral and physical effects, and evidence is brought forward from the Report of the British National Birth-rate Commission in support of his views. It is a very honest, straightforward, and highly useful treatise on one of the crying evils of the day, and one that cannot be ignored as existing even among Catholics.

In the other treatises, on the New Code in its relation to several important questions, Father Slater holds very determined views and sets forth at length the history of, and the principles governing, the questions, besides his weighty reasons for his views. In his paper on the Short Form of Extreme Unction, he says : ' There was no question about settling any theoretical opinions as to whether one anointing was valid or not, nor was there any question of settling the doubt as to whether the anointing of the five senses was essential to the validity of the sacrament ' ; the Holy Office was asked only for guidance as to the form to be used in case of necessity. To this alone it confined itself. It did not decide what was sufficient for the validity of the sacrament. ' We should not be justified,' says Father Slater, ' in asserting that what was doubtful before the decree is now absolutely certain. Such decrees (of the Holy Office) as that with which we are dealing are not infallible and irreformable utterances of the Holy See.' He then proceeds to prove his thesis, and quotes theologians in support of it, and concludes by quoting Canon 947 of the New Code, which is inserted in the Rubric of the New Ritual : ' In case of necessity one anointing is sufficient on one sense or better on the forehead with the prescribed short form, but the obligation remains of supplying the other anointings if the danger ceases.' He quotes also a reply of the Holy Office to the effect that the other anointings were not to be supplied *conditionally*.

In the case of the *Impedimentum Criminis* he holds that the New Code destroys all probability which the opinion may previously have had that ignorance excuses from it. Canon 2229 tells us that ignorance does not excuse from vindictive penalties. Now the impediment of crime is certainly a vindictive penalty *latae sententiae*. Therefore ignorance does not excuse from it. Still more clear is Canon 16 : ' No ignorance of annulling and incapacitating laws excuses from them unless the contrary is expressly stated.' And Canon 988 : ' Ignorance of irregularities, whether arising from crime or from defect, and ignorance of impediments, does not excuse from them.'

In dealing with the false accusation of solicitation, Father Slater puts forth his solution, which he calls tentative, namely, that the reservation

was inflicted as a penalty for crime, and, therefore, is a vindictive one. Hence ignorance does not excuse from it. 'It may be,' says our author, 'that this was specially intended by the Holy See, and was at least one reason why this sin alone was reserved to the Holy See on its own account.' We all know that it is now reserved to the Holy See both on its own account and on account of the censure of excommunication annexed to it. 'Even,' continues Father Slater, 'when in a particular case the censure is not incurred, still the sin will be reserved to the Holy See unless there is some reason which excuses from this reservation.'

Taking them all round, these papers are important contributions to vexed questions, and, written by Father Slater, they deserve more than ordinary consideration. His thorough acquaintance with the subjects cannot be doubted, and his powerful arguments cannot be lightly treated. Besides, his fair exposition of his opponents' views shows him to be an honest, candid critic, solely concerned about the truth, and desirous of getting at the mind of the Church.

M. R.

### BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (September).  
*The Ecclesiastical Review* (September). U.S.A.  
*The Rosary Magazine* (September). Somerset, Ohio.  
*The Catholic World* (September). New York.  
*The Austral Light* (August). Melbourne.  
*The Ave Maria* (September). Notre Dame, Indiana.  
*The Catholic Bulletin* (September). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Irish Monthly* (September). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Month* (September). London : Longmans.  
*Études* (September). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII<sup>e</sup>).  
*Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* (September). Paris : Beauchesne.  
*Revue du Clergé Français* (September). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.  
*The Fortnightly Review* (September). St. Louis, Mo.  
*The Lamp* (September). Garrison, N.Y.  
*Revue des Jeunes* (September). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.  
*A History of the Diocese of Raphoe*. By Very Rev. Canon Maguire, D.D.  
 Dublin : Browne & Nolan, Ltd.  
*Lehrbuch der experimentellen Psychologie*. Von Joseph Forbes, S.J.  
 Freiburg-im-Breisgau : Herder.  
*Theologia Moralis* (tom. ii). Auctore Jos. Aertnys, C.S.S.R. (10th ed.)  
*L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ*. Paris : Beauchesne.  
*The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures : The New Testament*  
 (Vol. III, Parts 3 and 4). London : Longmans, Green.  
*La Parousie*. Par Cardinal Louis Billot, S.J. Paris : Beauchesne.



# THE DATE OF THE 'OCTAVIUS' OF MINUCIUS FELIX

BY REV. R. HULL, S.J.

THE publication by Ebert, in 1870, of his *Tertullian's Verhältnis zu Minucius Felix* revived a controversy long dead. The claim of Tertullian to be considered the first, in order of time, of the Latin apologists had been almost universally accepted. Ebert's work put forward Minucius Felix as the writer to whom this honour is due. Since his time, and probably under his influence, many critics have agreed in giving Minucius the priority; though there have not been wanting those who defended the traditional view. On the other hand, there are some who would place Minucius after St. Cyprian—indeed, make him almost contemporaneous with Lactantius.

The diversity of opinion<sup>1</sup> certainly supports Harnack in his statement<sup>2</sup> that 'in the history of ancient Christian literature there is no problem more hopeless than that of fixing the date of the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix.' But despite its hopelessness (to some minds, indeed, because of its hopelessness) the problem is an interesting one; and it is not without its importance, at least inasmuch as it brings within its scope two such men as St. Cyprian and Tertullian.

The *Octavius*<sup>3</sup> is the only work of Minucius Felix that we possess. It describes a dialogue between a Christian, Octavius Januarius, and a pagan, Caecilius Natalis. Most unfortunately for our present purpose, Minucius, who acted as umpire during the discussion between his two friends,

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Bardenheuer, 180-92; Harnack, 235-249 (or 222-235); Von Schultze, 300-303; Salmon (in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*), 234; Dessau, c. 220; Keim, c. 180.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, ii. (1904).

<sup>3</sup> The *Octavius* is quoted by the chapters in Migne, *P.L.* 3; and by pages in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. ii., ed. Halm (Vienna). This double system will facilitate reference, as different editors have adopted different arrangements of the text of the *Octavius*.

has not given any sure indication of the length of time that elapsed between the discussion and the composition of the *Octavius*. Neglecting this particular question, our problem is: When did Minucius Felix write the *Octavius*?

Nowhere in the dialogue do we find any exact statement of time; there are, however, a few passages which bear directly on the question of date. In c. xxxi. and c. ix. there is mention of Fronto; and in c. xxxii. Octavius admits that the Christians have no temples. The passages are important; but a fact of greater significance is the relation between the *Octavius* and the *Quod idola non sunt dei* of St. Cyprian, and the writings (especially the *Apologeticus*<sup>1</sup>) of Tertullian. We propose, therefore, to begin with the examination of this fact.

The resemblances between the *Octavius* and the tract of St. Cyprian are most striking, many passages being verbatim the same in both. So close, indeed, is the similarity in thought and diction, that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that we have a case of plagiarism. Before we attempt to decide which was the original, it must be remarked that we accept the *Quod idola* as a genuine work of St. Cyprian; it could not have been composed before the year of his conversion 246, and is considered one of his earliest Christian works; we may date it in fact about 246-7. Did St. Cyprian use the *Octavius* in the composition of this tract?

It is to be noted that the very fact which might incline some critics to doubt its genuineness, tends to prove that, if, as we maintain, it is genuine, it is not the original on which the *Octavius* is based. That fact is the style of the first half of the work—*jejune*, stilted, and the connexion of thought not always clearly expressed. Now this is not the style of his letters and other work; it is easily explained, if he was not writing spontaneously, and as expressing naturally his own ideas, but was following closely the argument and whole sentences of another. On the other hand, the *Octavius*, when it corresponds with St. Cyprian, does not show these evidences of copying: the style is easy and smooth, and exhibits the strength and freshness so noticeable in the whole dialogue.

This consideration alone, then, seems to suggest that the *Octavius* was the original. And an actual comparison

<sup>1</sup> Written in 197.



of the two only strengthens this belief. It is precisely where the common element appears that the defects of St. Cyprian's work are most apparent.

In c. iii.<sup>1</sup> we find St. Cyprian unconsciously showing that he is using the *Octavius*. The whole argument, from the beginning of the tract, follows closely *Octavius*, c. xx. fol. St. Cyprian has been stating that the pagan gods are merely kings, honoured by their peoples after death, hence the variety of rites and religions. So far he follows Minucius : at this point Minucius goes on to speak of these rites, and to criticise (c. xxi.-xxv.) the theory, with a view to emphasizing his contention that, after all, their gods are nothing more than men ; he then (c. xxv.) considers the idea that these gods at least gave Rome her great power and empire. Now what do we find in St. Cyprian ? In place of the four chapters of the *Octavius* (c. xxi.-xxv.) he has inserted two sentences (about two lines), ' Si autum . . . defecit,'<sup>2</sup> which are indeed taken from the *Octavius*, but really break his argument ; whereas in the *Octavius* they form part of a long argument which connects the preceding discussion with c. xxv. fol. In other words, St. Cyprian has followed Minucius very closely up to a certain section ; he then omitted about four chapters and started copying again at c. xxv. If he had omitted the entire argument of those chapters his own work would have been consecutive in thought. But he has picked out these two or three lines from the four chapters and placed them in his own tract—thus, of course, destroying to a certain extent the logical sequence of ideas.

We can trace still more clearly the method of St. Cyprian in his use of the *Octavius*, by a consideration of the connexion, or rather, absolute disconnexion, of c. vii. and c. viii.<sup>3</sup> As remarked above, he has followed *Octavius* (c. xx. fol.) from the beginning of the tract : the end of his c. vii. corresponds with the end of c. xxvii. in the *Octavius*. There, *Octavius* proceeds naturally to draw a conclusion from the preceding discussion, viz., that since the devils are responsible for the calumnies against the Christians, one must be on one's guard against a too ready acceptance of what is said against them ; and in confirmation of this, he goes on to recount his own experience, referring to his attitude to the Christians before his conversion.

<sup>1</sup> Migne, P.L. 4, 588.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 589.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 4, 596.

Now St. Cyprian, who has carefully followed Minucius up to the point where Octavius blames the devils for the evil reputation attaching to the Christians, does not follow him further in drawing the practical conclusion from this, as this conclusion, in the *Octavius*, is bound up with the personal history of Octavius, and therefore was not available for his purpose. St. Cyprian abruptly leaves the argument, and goes on to state an entirely new position, viz., the unity of God. It is true that he has written, 'Unus igitur omnium Dominus Deus,' but the *igitur* certainly expresses no logical connexion: it is merely a literary device, supplying an apparent link between the two topics.

The following consideration also points to the conclusion that St. Cyprian copied from the *Octavius*. One of the most noticeable features of this latter work is the entire absence of any discussion on such fundamental doctrines as those concerning Our Lord: it is concerned primarily with combating the scepticism and polytheism of the pagan world. But St. Cyprian's tract does treat of Christ, and the origin of the true religion. It is obvious, then, that, at least in this part of his work, he cannot have been following the *Octavius*, and we should expect to find a corresponding difference in the style. Now we are not unaware of the absurdity of trying to determine such questions by processes of exact measurement; but we may mention that in cc. xii., xiv., xv.,<sup>1</sup> when St. Cyprian is dealing with the life and gospel of Christ, there are ten sentences; whereas in a passage of the same length at the beginning of the tract there are twenty-four. Whatever this fact may be worth, it is certain that in the later portion of the tract, when St. Cyprian is dealing with matter of which Minucius did not treat, we find that the marked peculiarities of the earlier portions are conspicuous by their absence. We can only appeal to a reading of the tract to establish this contention; but to us the difference between the two portions is as great as that between a collection of bricks, which are cemented together to form a wall, and a living organism with the harmonious articulation of its parts.

The comparison of the *Quod idola* and the *Octavius* points to the latter as the original work. It cannot, then,

<sup>1</sup> Migne, P.L. 4, 600 et seq.



have been composed later than 246-7. We must now ask what is the relation between it and the writings of Tertullian.

The question is in some ways more difficult than in the case of St. Cyprian. The style of the latter is much more obviously that of a borrower than is Minucius—not that the latter has not himself drawn largely on previous writers. His debt to Cicero (especially to the *De Natura Deorum* and the *De Divinatione*) and to Seneca (*De Superstitione* and *De Providentia*) is very great; and there are echoes of Virgil, Lucretius and Horace in the dialogue. But his genius has shown itself in combining all his different sources into an artistic whole: the *Octavius* has all the strength and sureness of touch of original work. And certainly nobody would wish to deny the originality and force of Tertullian. The comparison of the two, therefore, from the point of view of style, and logical coherence of thought, is not as easy or as fruitful as in the case of St. Cyprian—and indeed has not led us to any settled conclusion.

Another criterion has been used, viz., the character of the common Ciceronian passages in the *Octavius* and the *Apologeticus*. But this, in the hands of two such competent critics as Ebert and Salmon, has produced two contradictory results. We need not here follow them into the discussion<sup>1</sup>; but it is to be noted that if this test, which certainly *prima facie* seems absolutely crucial, has failed, there does not appear to be much hope of any similar method leading to a solution of the question.

But the character and genius of Tertullian, and the circumstances under which he wrote the *Apologeticus*, make it almost ridiculous to imagine that he would have borrowed from Minucius. On the other hand, the latter's genius consisted largely in his extraordinary power of using the work of others: his dialogue combines in a marked degree the characteristics of dependence and originality. The character of a borrower ill befits Tertullian in his *Apologeticus*; it is perfectly suited to Minucius Felix in his *Octavius*. It is at least more probable that the *Apologeticus* was the earlier of the two writings.

Let us now examine the general character of the *Octavius*? What is the state of society, political and

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of this criterion, cf. *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, s.v. 'Minucius Felix.'

religious, which it supposes? What are the views about the Roman Empire, and the Roman gods, which are advocated or rejected? What is the position of Christians? Does the book bear evidence of composition in the time of persecution? These are some of the questions, the answers to which may enable us to date the work with a certain degree of probability.

Unlike the *Apologeticus*, which is a plea for justice put forward during the heat of persecution, the *Octavius* appears to have been written when the Christians were not being subjected to active molestation. There is indeed one passage (c. xxxvii.) where the tortures and punishments of the martyrs are explicitly mentioned; but there is nothing to show that Minucius knew of such scenes as a common occurrence at the time of writing. There is not that burning sense of present injustice which so inflamed Tertullian in his *Apologeticus*. Moreover, the whole tone of the *Octavius* is in keeping with this. It betrays no symptom of fear or of need of concealment. It discusses the questions of the unity and nature of God, the doctrine of rewards and punishment, and the various calumnies against the Christian, in a calm and philosophic spirit, which has no affinity with the emotions usually associated with a time of persecution.

This critical spirit brings into prominence a noteworthy character of the Christian's attitude in the dialogue towards the pagan. Octavius is not only not afraid to meet Caecilius on his own ground of philosophic speculation, but he manifests, in no uncertain manner, a sense of confident superiority. The pagans were only too ready to despise the Christians as the uneducated and illiterate dregs of the people. But it was, in fact, Octavius who provoked the whole discussion by taunting Caecilius with his blind and vulgar superstition in worshipping Serapis.<sup>1</sup> Caecilius accepts the challenge: and throughout the argument Octavius maintains his original point of view. He argues that the ancient philosophers agree as to the unity of God, although they give different names to this supreme principle, and concludes 'quavis arbitretur aut nunc Christianos philosophos esse, aut philosophos fuisse iam tunc Christianos.'<sup>2</sup> It is, then, the pagan view which is foolish.

<sup>1</sup> 'In hac imperitiæ caecitate,' *Oct.* c. iii., *Corp. Script.* p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Oct.* c. xx., *Corp. Script.* p. 28.



As he says, when discussing the mythology of the gods, 'these stupid stories are handed down by our simple ancestors, and we elaborate them by our own industry and energy.'<sup>1</sup> Again, he points out the credulity of the pagans<sup>2</sup> and their delight in legends<sup>3</sup>; and how this same credulity has led them to believe in their gods, 'maiores nostri, improvidi, creduli, rudi simplicitate crediderunt.'<sup>4</sup> Caecilius had urged that, as certainty was not obtainable, or at least as the Christians were too uneducated to be competent to discuss matters of religion, they should be content to accept the traditional religion.<sup>5</sup> Octavius shows the weakness of this position, by examining the origin and nature of these ancient cults. It is not the Christian, but the pagan, who is open to a charge of obscurantism, even on the principles of their own philosophers. As Minucius puts it in his summing up: 'malevolos iisdem illis, quibus armantur, philosophorum telis retudisset,'<sup>6</sup> Octavius had repelled the attacks of the ill-disposed by retorting the arguments from those very philosophers on whom they relied. Now this implies a condition of things in which Christianity has found a firm footing, even in the ranks of the educated: it is not merely tolerated on sufferance; it feels strong enough to carry the war into the enemy's country; and to appeal even to those who pride themselves on their intellectual superiority, using against them their own weapons. Again, such a procedure is not in sympathy with a period of persecution. Persecution, it is clear, was a thing well known both to the pagan and Christian; but it was not at that time exercising its terrors against the latter. If it is true that in Tatian's *πρὸς Ἑλλήνας* and in Tertullian's *Ad nationes* parallels might be found with this attitude of superiority and aggressiveness, nevertheless, taken in conjunction with the view of the Roman Empire which is expressed in the dialogue, it points to a date somewhat later than these two writings.

In opposition to the pleasing theory<sup>7</sup> that the Romans owed their Empire, in its origin and growth, to their religious character and the favour of their gods, Octavius

<sup>1</sup> Oct. c. xxii., *Corp. Script.* p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Oct. c. xx., *Corp. Script.* p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Oct. c. v., *Corp. Script.* p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Oct. c. xxxix., *Corp. Script.* p. 55.

<sup>7</sup> Oct. c. vi., *Corp. Script.* p. 9.

in a few vigorous sentences<sup>1</sup> sketches the actual beginning of Rome, 'Ita quidquid Romani tenent, colunt, possident, audaciae praeda est.' Their empire and their religion were founded on violence, rape, murder. His criticism of their sacred rites and auguries is no less outspoken. Some are full of gloom and misery<sup>2</sup>; some are simply stupid<sup>3</sup>; some are mere forms of physical torture,<sup>4</sup> *non sacra, tormenta sunt*. Then the statues and images of the gods turn them into laughing-stocks. The very animals despise them.<sup>5</sup> Their ceremonies survive, because they are based on a common error, and are defended by common practice, 'defensio communis furoris est furentium multitudo.'<sup>6</sup>

This seems to point to the third century rather than to the second. The later the date the easier it is to account for this drastic criticism of the foundation of the Empire, and the Empire's gods and religious rites. And, moreover, it is almost impossible to believe that such language could have been used of the Empire in the second century. For at that time the Empire was still Roman; it still retained its ancient glory: it had not yet become universalized; Rome was still supreme; the levelling process, which was to rob her of the glory of her isolation, was not yet complete. Again, the Emperors in that period were not inferior to their ancestors in any of the great Roman virtues of government. Commodus, undoubtedly, was a miserable Emperor; but Commodus degraded himself: the Empire still was safe in the hands of able administrators, who had been promoted to office by Marcus Aurelius. Moreover, Commodus was succeeded by Septimius Severus, a man of a very different stamp: his rule enabled the subjects of Rome to recover from the shock of seeing his brutal and degenerate predecessor clothed with the imperial purple. He succeeded in delaying the utter decay and dismemberment of the Empire, which was to take place not many years after his death. The first of the military despots of the third century, he used his power wisely against the forces of chaos and disorder. But Caracalla, whose tyrannical violence did not stop at a brother's murder, in order to grasp sole and undisputed power; Macrinus,

<sup>1</sup> Oct. c. xxv., *Corp. Script.* p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> Oct. c. xxiv., *Corp. Script.* p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Oct. c. xxi., *Corp. Script.* p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> Oct. c. xxiv., *Corp. Script.* p. 34.

<sup>6</sup> Oct. c. xxiv., *Corp. Script.* p. 35.



who was not of senatorial rank: Elagabalus, a pervert, whose 'short reign was from beginning to end an orgy without parallel in the history of Rome,'<sup>1</sup> were Emperors who, in one way or another, hastened the degradation of Rome, and the disruption of the Empire. Alexander Severus gave ten years of peace; but in 235, on his murder, one of the darkest periods of Roman history began; and not till 268, when Claudius was proclaimed Emperor, was there any ground for hope that the Empire had not at last come in its final days.

Such views, then, as the dialogue discovers, reflect most naturally the state of the Empire, and its position in men's minds during the first half of the third century.

It was stated above that there were two references in the *Octavius* which seem to give definite evidence of date. In c. ix., Caecilius appeals to a certain speech of a native of Cirta in confirmation of a statement concerning the Christian banquets: 'id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio.' In c. xxxi., Octavius, replying to the charge, identifies this person with Fronto, 'tuus Fronto . . . ut orator aspersit.' There seems to be every probability that this Fronto is the tutor of Marcus Aurelius; but there is no indication, either of the date of the speech referred to, or of the length of time which had elapsed between the speech and the dialogue. We cannot, therefore, date the dialogue by the speech; but the reference enables us to fix a *terminus a quo*, viz., about A.D. 160. The second possible indication of time occurs in c. x., where Caecilius brings as an objection against the Christians the fact that they have no *templa*. Octavius, in c. xxxii., does not deny this. It is disputed whether by *templa* we must understand pagan temples or not. But even if, at least in the mouth of Octavius,<sup>2</sup> the word must signify a Christian church, the admission that the Christians had no *templa* indicates the earlier half of the third century: it certainly renders very improbable the view that the *Octavius* was written after the *Quod idola*, as all available evidence tends to prove that between the Valerian and the Diocletian persecution there was a great expansion of the external, corporate Christian life, which included the building of

<sup>1</sup> Stuart Jones, *Roman Empire*, p. 266.

<sup>2</sup> In support of this, cf. *Arnob. adv. Gentes*. lib. vi., c. 1, *Corp. Script. Eccles. Latin.* vol. iv. pp. 214 et seq.; and *Origen contr. Celsum*. viii. 17, *Die Griech. Christ. Schriften*, pp. 234 et seq.

churches ; while, on the other hand, it seems equally certain that, before that period, the Christians did not possess churches, i.e., buildings set aside for religious purposes,<sup>1</sup> and known to all, pagan and Christian, as such.

The examination of the evidence so far considered has led us to adopt the first half of the third century as the most probable date for the composition of the dialogue. Does this probability find any confirmation from the external evidence ? Certainly our external sources are very meagre. But, such as they are, they support the view already suggested.

St. Jerome is not an historian of the first rank, but his testimony has recently been too much underestimated. This, perhaps, is due to a failure to notice the different character of the places in his works where he mentions Minucius. In the letters we find the latter placed after Cyprian<sup>2</sup> ; in the *De Viris Illustribus*<sup>3</sup> he comes between Tertullian and Cyprian. There can be no doubt that the latter represents St. Jerome's real opinion. In the former there is no indication whatever that he even supposes he is giving a chronological list of names : but here, he expressly states his purpose of giving such a list ; and, moreover, seems to emphasize the position of Tertullian in such a manner as to make it certain that Minucius must be placed after him. In the prologue, the opening words are as follows : ' Hortaris me, Dexter, ut Tranquillum sequens, ecclesiasticos scriptores in ordinem digeram.' ' You urge me, Dexter, to imitate the example of Tranquillus (Suetonius), and compose a chronological list of ecclesiastical writers.' In this list he explicitly draws attention to the fact that Tertullian is the first Latin writer after Victor and Apollonius—Minucius, therefore, must be placed after him. He is, in fact, the fifth name after Tertullian, and Cyprian's name is the ninth after Minucius. There can, therefore, be no reason for doubting that Jerome thought Minucius came about half way between Tertullian and Cyprian, and that he felt particularly certain that Tertullian came before Minucius.

From the nature of Jerome's list, it seems most probable that the date which determined the place in the list was the date, not of birth or death, but of the individual's

<sup>1</sup> A collection of the chief evidence may be found in Bingham's *Antiquities*, Bk. viii. c. 1, and in Migne, *P.G.* 11, 1540.

<sup>2</sup> Migne, *P.L.*, 22, 502.

<sup>3</sup> c. 58 (Migne *P.L.*, 23. 635 706).



literary activity. This would date the *Octavius* somewhere about 210–220.

Now this would square with our knowledge of Gaius, who is named next<sup>1</sup> to Minucius. We learn that he had a very famous dispute with Proculus, at the time when Zephyrinus was Bishop of Rome, and Antoninus, the son of Severus, was Emperor. Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> more than once, states that Gaius had lived in the pontificate of Zephyrinus. The Emperor mentioned by Jerome is better known as Caracalla, and reigned 211–217; and Zephyrinus' pontificate is dated 198–217. We have, therefore, a date somewhere between 211 and 217 for Gaius. This date agrees very well with his place in St. Jerome's list, and is in so far a confirmation of it. Moreover, this contention is strengthened, rather than weakened, if, as is very probable, he obtained his information from Eusebius. In short, there is not sufficient reason for rejecting the testimony of St. Jerome, who, by emphasizing the priority of Tertullian before all Latin apologists, and by placing Minucius in particular between Tertullian and St. Cyprian, certainly shows that he must be assigned to the first half of the third century, and in all probability to the period of about 210–220.

There remains the evidence of certain inscriptions. About fifty years ago there were discovered at Ciria six inscriptions<sup>3</sup> bearing the name of Marcus Caecilius Natalis. They show that he filled all the offices of municipal government under Septimius Severus and Caracalla; he erected a bronze statue of the *Securitas Saeculi* in honour of his aedileship, and another to the *Indulgentia* of Severus in memory of his *triumvirate*, which he held in 210; while holding the highest municipal office (*quinquennialitas*) some years later, he erected a triumphal arch with a bronze statue to the *Virtus* of Caracalla; finally, he dispensed liberal largesses to his fellow-townsmen. He was, then, one of the leading men of Ciria, was probably well educated and a pagan. Can he be identified with the Caecilius of the *Oclavius*? Dessau<sup>4</sup> has maintained the identification; Harnack<sup>5</sup> considers it not certain, and the same view is stated by the latest English editor.<sup>6</sup> The force of the

<sup>1</sup> One codex places him immediately before Minucius; except for this, he is always placed immediately after him.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 25, vi. 20.

<sup>3</sup> *C.I.L.* viii. n. 6996, 7094–7098.

<sup>4</sup> *Hermes*, 1880, xv. <sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 327.

<sup>6</sup> Freese, p. xv. [An edition by an Irish editor, Rev. T. Fahy, M.A., B.D., Maynooth, was published in 1919, by the Educational Co. of Ireland.—ED.]

argument for the identification can be best appreciated by a consideration of the implications of the opposite view. As we have seen, the dialogue very probably belongs to the first half of the third century. In it Minucius introduces us to a Caecilius Natalis, a man of education, a pagan, a native of Cirta. The inscriptions, in the first place, appear to us to make this at least certain, viz., that the Caecilius of the dialogue is not a fictitious person. It would be incredible that Minucius merely imagined a person whose name, position, and native town should so closely correspond with those of the actual Caecilius of the inscriptions. If, then, we are dealing with a real person in the dialogue, is it possible that a person, whose existence is attested by these inscriptions, who agrees in all essentials with the person of the dialogue, can be other than the person of the dialogue?

A comparison of the *Octavius* with the *Quod idola* of St. Cyprian, and with the work of Tertullian, the general characters of the dialogue as a reflection of the age which produced it, the two more or less definite indications of date which it contains, and the evidence of St. Jerome, all conspire to establish the first half of the third century as the probable time of its composition. The acceptance of this conclusion implies, as the date of the dialogue, the very period to which the inscriptions belong. The inscriptions, then, and the dialogue present to us a person named Caecilius Natalis, living at the same time, in the same place, of the same social position and education. The only explanation of this can be that the inscriptions and the dialogue present to us the same person.

We have, then, in the inscriptions evidence giving us a date for the Caecilius of the dialogue. In 215, when he held the highest municipal office at Cirta, it is practically certain he was still a pagan. He was converted by his discussion with Octavius; we must, therefore, place that dialogue after 215. Again, the *Octavius* was written before the *Quod idola* of St. Cyprian; it must, therefore, be placed before 246. The limits, therefore, between which both the dialogue and the *Octavius* must be placed are the years 215 and 246. It is, indeed, tempting to accept St. Jerome's testimony strictly, and thus date both 215-217. But we do not think that this can be justified. As the evidence stands, it is not possible to obtain a closer approximation than 215-246.

R. HULL, S.J.



# THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ART

## THE SACRED ART OF SPAIN<sup>1</sup>

BY REV. E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

SPANISH art is essentially a sacred art, an art which developed under the influence of the Spanish Church and under the inspiration of that deep and fervent faith to which the Spaniard clings with such loyal and enthusiastic devotion. A review of the records of Spanish art and of the lives and life-work of those men who carried painting through its different phases of development shows clearly that their chief encouragement came from the Church, for, in Spain, as in other lands, she was ever ready to enlist the diviner talents in her services. She gave willingly of her wealth. She provided opportunity for ability, and in her generous patronage lay the greatest stimulus to supreme artistic endeavour. Hence we find the spirit of faith and the influence of Catholic thought of the greatest import in the whole artistic life of Spain.

To be able to appreciate fully the great beauty of Spanish art one must visit the galleries of Madrid or that wonderful city by the Guadalquivir, which cradled the genius of Zurbaran, Murillo and Velazquez. But the lover of sacred art can study gems of the Spanish masters in all the national collections of Europe. No country has suffered more than Spain in the plunder and dispersion of her sacred pictures, but her loss has been the world's gain, however unjust the means by which she was despoiled of her treasures. During the Peninsular wars and during the cruel suppression of the monasteries under the Liberal Communes of 1820 England acquired a large share of the spoils. Hence, in the public galleries and in the numerous private collections of this country we find some of the finest examples of Spanish art.

During the sixteenth century, which historians tell us was the *siglo de oro* of Spanish literature and art, the full

<sup>1</sup> An article in this series on the Sacred Art of Italy appeared in the I. E. RECORD for April, 1915

influence of the Renaissance penetrated into the Iberian peninsula and, under social and political conditions that were favourable to the culture and development of the arts, a new activity appeared in the various art centres, and the native genius, so long enslaved to imitation of foreign example, put forth its own great powers in creating a school of painting that was distinctly and essentially national. But, though this century saw the great revolution in painting, the preceding centuries have their records of artistic achievement. The archives of the cathedrals preserve the names of a host of artists employed by the ecclesiastical bodies from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century; but as specimens of their mural and easel pictures are rare, it is difficult to arrive at a true appreciation of the standards reached by this pre-Renaissance painting. In the sixteenth century great numbers of pictures by those early painters were cast aside as valueless, whilst mural paintings were effaced in order to give space to the work of the better artists. Thus did the wave of the more brilliant art of the sixteenth century sweep the earlier art away with the exception of the few examples that are to be found in the national collections and cathedrals. And, judging from these, Spanish pre-Renaissance painting possessed many elements of excellence, of technical merit and refinement. It was scattered over an age of experimental borrowings and isolated endeavour, when the painter lived in the seclusion of the monasteries, or was precluded by circumstances from benefiting by the experience of others, yet it is an art of remarkable merit, and not altogether lacking in originality. In fact, some of those distinctive features of the Spanish picture, so perfected in the painting of the Renaissance, may be traced to this earlier art. These are peculiar effects of flesh tint and shadow, obtained by painting over deep olive grounds, and a wonderful mellowness of atmosphere and tone in the blending of light and shade. These characteristics will always discover the Spanish picture, and distinguish it from paintings of a foreign school. They are as vivid and striking to the eye of the artist and the connoisseur as those contrasts that exist between the plaint sweet melodies of Italy and the weird strains of the Andalusian love-song.

A very prominent feature in the art of the pre-Renaissance is the Retablo, which became the predominant taste in



reredos decoration for several centuries. The Retablo is a blending of carving and colouring, a *genre* of polychrome sculpture which is peculiar to Spain. It is of purely Gothic inspiration, and is evidently the result of a desire to preserve a graceful harmony between decorative detail in the altar and the elaborate ornamentation of the Spanish church interior. The Retablo is generally the work of the best artists of the period to which it belongs, and gives evidence of very considerable artistic powers and technical skill. In general it has met with unfavourable comment from English and German critics, yet the Retablo will always hold a place amongst the wonders of Spanish art. In the great cathedrals it is always of an impressive character. It stands out in magnificent relief in those sombre interiors where paintings would be entirely lost. The Retablo in the Cathedral of Seville is one of the great masterpieces of this style of art. It consists of forty-five sectional groups of figures illustrative of the life of the Blessed Virgin. The central figure, 'the Virgin de la Sede,' is a work in silver by the celebrated artist Francisco Alfara. The Retablo in the 'Capilla Mayor' of the Cathedral of Toledo, backed by the wonderful *transparente*, which gives extraordinary light effects to marble, sculpture and colouring, is one of the most magnificent and unique creations of Spanish art.

According to early records the Spanish artist was a man of serious and dignified character, and was wont to view his work as a very sacred occupation. A great number of artists, like Juan Sanchez Cotan, became inmates of the cloister, whilst others, like Juan de Juanes, affected great religious fervour and sanctity of life in the world. Painting to Juanes was a solemn exercise, and when undertaking any work of importance he always sought for inspiration in prayer.

In the popular mind the character of the artist became invested with a peculiar sacredness, and amongst the illiterate poor, especially, to whom the sacred pictures appealed so forcibly, he was held in the greatest reverence. Sterling, in his appreciation of the aesthetic values of the Spanish pictures, says : 'The great pathos and expressive silence of these paintings might fix the eye that would drop to sleep beneath the glozings of the Jesuit, and melt the heart that would remain untouched by all the thunders of the Dominican.'

The Inquisition must have had a retarding influence on the development of Spanish pre-Renaissance painting. It instituted a code of rules to be followed by painters, but it was evidently with the purpose of preserving the national art from the pagan extravagances that tended to debase the Italian art of the Renaissance. However, the action of the Inquisition did not place any serious curb upon the aspiring genius of the sixteenth century, as we see from the progress of art at the various centres and the rapid improvement in style and taste.

During the historic reign of Ferdinand and Isabella a number of notable Italian and Flemish artists came to Spain, the superior excellence of whose work had an elevating influence upon the native talent, especially in the schools of Andalusia and Castile. The artists of Castile adopted an Italianesque style, the chief representatives of which, during the later decades of the fifteenth century, were Fernandez Gallegos and Antonio del Rincon. Early in the sixteenth century the Castillian school had a number of talented artists, notable amongst whom were Juan de Borgona and Fernandez del Rincon, whose work can be seen in the famous Retablo of Toledo. Mural paintings and episcopal portraits by Juan de Borgona are preserved in the Cathedral and chapter-room of Toledo, whilst in the Prado Gallery at Madrid he holds a conspicuous place in the important collection of works by the leading masters of this period.

The Sevillian masters, notable amongst whom were Juan Sanchez de Castro, Juan Nunez and Gonzalo Diaz, were instrumental in establishing the Hispano-Flemish style in the schools of the south, which seems to have prevailed down to the last decades of the sixteenth century, when a period of transition came, and the first elements of a national character appeared in Spanish art. The masters of this period of transition were Alonzo Berrugette Vargas, Pedro Campana, Roelas, Ribalta, El Mudo, Vincento Juanes and Morales. These are the artists whose work show the greatest advance towards originality and independence, and who paved the way for Cano, Zurbaran, Velazquez and Murillo, the men whose genius brought Spanish art to its supreme degree of perfection in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Alonzo Berrugette was an artist of versatile genius. He spent a number of years in Italy, where he studied



architecture, sculpture and painting, and his return to his native land, where he found extensive employment, marks the dawn of the Renaissance of Spanish art. His work was confined mostly to architecture and sculpture, and he devoted but little time to painting, yet he is recognized as the leading master of this period in the whole circle of the arts. Whilst in Italy he was a student of Michael Angelo, and his sculpture in the Cathedral of Toledo breaths something of the spirit of the great Italian artist. His paintings, the best of which are at Salamanca and Valladolid, are somewhat Raphaelesque in treatment and inspiration.

Contemporary with Berruette were three notable masters of the south—Vargas, Campana and El Mudo. Luis de Vargas, sometimes known as the ‘hermit’ painter, because he practised the piety and austerities of a recluse, was the founder of the high school of art in Seville, and was considered the greatest master of drawing of the period. He is famous in his picture ‘The Generations of Christ,’ which is generally known as ‘The Gamba,’ because of the prominence of the leg of Adam. Vargas painted with wonderful feeling, particularly when the subject was Christ in His Passion. In one of the street—shrines of Seville he painted Christ carrying the Cross. It was held in great veneration by the populace, and prisoners on their way to execution were brought before it to pray. For this reason it was called ‘El Cristo de los Azatados’ —‘Christ of the Criminals.’

Pedro Campana, though born in Flanders, was a Spaniard by descent, and spent most of his artistic life in Spain. His masterpieces are preserved at Seville, among which are ‘The Descent from the Cross’ and ‘The Purification of the Blessed Virgin.’ ‘The Descent from the Cross,’ which is in the sacristy of the Cathedral, gives a wonderful impression of life and movement. Murillo, who used to stand in contemplation before this picture, was once heard to say: ‘I am waiting till these holy men take down Our Lord.’

Juan Fernandez Naverette, known as ‘El Mudo,’ figures pathetically in the history of Spanish art. He was deaf and dumb, nevertheless he was one of art’s presiding genius at this period. He possessed great artistic powers, as is evident from the originality of his painting. He is considered the rival of Titian as a brilliant colourist, and the

equal of Velazquez as a master of drawing. His best pictures—'The Holy Family,' 'St. Jerome,' and 'The Execution of St. James'—are amongst the art treasures of the Royal Escorial College, Madrid, but it is said that the masterpieces from his brush are at Estrella, where he spent his childhood's years.

Luis de Morales, a representative of the school of Castile, was another great painter of this period. He was called the 'Divine Morales' because of the deep religious feeling of his pictures, especially when he painted the Saviour of the world, the favourite theme of his brush. Another, Angelico, 'fervent faith and religious enthusiasm made him a great painter. His Christs breathe nothing but the most sublime expression of self-sacrifice and resigned love.'

Roelas, 'the clerical artist' of Seville, came late in this century. He combined all the qualities of excellence to be found in the painting of his predecessors, and soaring above the mannerists of the previous generation, succeeded in bringing a new element of originality and independence into the national art. All the great works of Roelas are at Seville, amongst which are 'The Martyrdom of St. Andrew,' 'The Liberation of St. Peter,' and 'The Death of St. Isodor,' which is considered the finest specimen of this master's work.

The school of Valencia, which was the oldest in Spain, became an important art centre in the days of the saintly Archbishop, Thomas of Villanova, O.S.A. It was the nursery of some celebrated artists, amongst whom were Llanos, Yanes, Joanes, Ribera and Ribalta. Sterling, speaking of this school, says:—

It grew into note under the enlightened care of the good Archbishop, St. Thomas of Villanova. Illustrious alike for piety and benevolence, this prelate became a favourite saint of the south, and seemed, as it were, a new canonization from the pencils of Valencia and Seville. There were few churches or convents on the sunny side of the Sierra Morena without some memorial picture of this holy man. These pictorial distinctions were due, not only to his boundless charity, but to his munificent patronage of art which he employed, not to swell his episcopal estate but to embellish his cathedral and to instruct and to improve his flock.<sup>1</sup>

Vincento Joanes and his son Juan are amongst the notable representatives of the early Renaissance painting in the school of Valencia. They were the leading artists there in the days of St. Thomas. It is said that their



studio was like an oratory, and that they always began their work with devotional exercises. In the Valencian churches and institutions we find a great number of their paintings, whilst the Paris and Madrid galleries are rich in specimens of their work. The 'Christ of the Violet Robe' by Vincento Joanes, which is in the Cathedral of Valencia, is the masterpiece of his art.

Ribalta was the next great master of Valencia in the generation of artists that followed Joanes in the last decades of the sixteenth century. He acquired his first knowledge of painting in the school of his native city, and afterwards travelled in Italy, where he founded his style on the Bolognese masters. He is referred to by some writers as the Dominichino of Spain. At Valencia we find the most important of his works—'The Last Supper'—in the College of Corpus Christi, in that city, being the greatest of his pictures.

Ribera, or 'Lo Spagnoletto,' as he is generally called, was a pupil of Ribalta in Valencia. Early in life he went to Italy, where he spent the greater part of his career. In the treatment of the various subjects of his art, Ribera displays extraordinary imaginative powers, whilst, perhaps, no other painter has ever produced in his pictures such striking contrasts of feeling. There is a wonderful supernatural beauty and childlike innocence in his Madonnas and Magdalenes, whilst in his mortified anchorites and martyrdoms there is weird and gloomy realism. Realism is, perhaps, the chief characteristic of Ribera's art. His painting of the Immaculate Conception in the Augustinian church of Salamanca, which has not been surpassed by Murillo, and his 'St. Agnes' in the Dresden Gallery, are two of the greatest masterpieces of sacred art, whilst his studies of the Apostles in the Prado Gallery in Madrid are considered to be the finest specimens of pictorial relief in the world.

Ribera's art produced a profound impression upon the younger talent in the school of Seville, where Zurbaran, Cano, Velazquez, and Murillo adopted his principles of realism. Of these, Zurbaran, who preceded Velazquez and Murillo in fame, carried realism to its extremes, creating a style of painting of a singularly individualistic character. Zurbaran can never be mistaken. No other artist has attempted such daring intensity of light and shadow, or such austere and aesthetic realism as appears in his scenes

of Carthusian life. He worked many years under the patronage of the Carthugas of Cordova and Seville before he became court painter to Philip IV. In the latter city he painted his greatest work, 'The Apotheosis of St. Thomas Aquinas,' which is now in the picture gallery. This picture is supposed to be a superb masterpiece of modelling and grouping. St. Thomas and the four great Doctors of the Church hold a central place in the picture. In the glory above them is the Saviour with the Blessed Virgin, St. Paul, and St. Dominic, whilst in the foreground is a group of knights and ecclesiastics, amongst whom are Charles V and Archbishop Deza, the founder of the college for which the picture was painted. There are wonderful relief effects in this painting.

Amongst the contemporaries of Zurbaran, Alonzo Cano holds a prominent place as the chief representative of the school of Granada. Cano and Montanez, an artist of the same school, were revivalists of the Retablo, and painted sculpture of the quattrocentist period, and their work is the perfection of this style of art. At the age of twenty-four Alonzo Cano had won fame as a sculptor, and the well-merited recognition of his talents secured for him extensive employment in the churches of southern Spain, where we find the best examples of his work. The 'Madonna' over the lectern in the Cathedral of Granada and the 'Immaculate Conception' in the sacristy are gems of sculpture. It was late in life that Cano gave serious thought to painting. Circumstances that saddened his life brought him to Valencia, where he entered the Carthusian monastery of Porta Coeli. It was there that he began to devote some of his time to painting, and the great genius of the man shows itself in the rapidity with which he mastered every detail of technique and brought his art to such a high standard of perfection. He spent his later years at Granada as a beneficed canon, and in the dome of the Cathedral he painted his greatest picture, 'The Life of the Blessed Virgin.'

The two supreme representatives of Spanish art are Velazquez and Murillo, both of whom sprung from the school of Seville. Whilst it is universally admitted that the genius of these two men brought the national art to its supreme degree of perfection there is some contention amongst connoisseurs and critics as to which of the two is the greater master. Some, in their evident antipathy



to the mystical subjects of Murillo's art, give the laurels to Velazquez, and lavish the highest encomiums upon his secular painting; but to try to underrate the merits of either of these great artists is one of the absurd mistakes of enthusiasts. In our admiration of their work we must lose sight of all comparative criticism, for their powers of representation, their mastery of drawing, and their exquisite handling of colour place these two great Spaniards upon a plane of equality, though in ideal, in feeling, or in imaginative faculty they differ.

Velazquez was Murillo's senior by seventeen years, and was well established in his career when Murillo, as a poor orphan boy, was bartering his small pictures for a few pesetas at the religious festas of Andalusia. Velazquez's abilities as a painter matured in the school of his native Seville, where it soon became evident to himself and his masters that his success as a painter would be in portraiture. His two early pictures show the trend and possibilities of his powers. One, 'The Adoration of the Shepherds,' was a distinct discouragement to enter the domain of sacred art, for it lacked that refined aesthetic feeling which he saw in the canvases of Ribera and Zurbaran; whilst his other picture, 'The Water-carrier of Seville,' proved to be a magnificent specimen of portraiture and realism, and was plainly indicative of the style of painting that he should follow.

At the age of twenty-three Velazquez set out for Madrid, where two Sevillian courtiers, Canon Fonseca and the Count de Olevarez, recognizing the claims of a compatriot, procured facilities for him to paint the royal portrait. This work, when executed, so pleased the Spanish monarch that Velazquez was immediately appointed court painter. Thus was his fame established, but from the time of his appointment to the Spanish court Velazquez' work was almost exclusively confined to portraiture, and he never applied his great genius to any work of magnitude or importance. The various court dignities conferred upon him made enormous demands on his time, and several later pictures ascribed to him were not finished by his own hand. His ambitions seem to have been peculiarly circumscribed. He did not want to wander beyond the court circles of Madrid until the date of his intimacy with Rubens. The great Flemish painter inspired him with the idea of visiting the Italian cities and studying the art of the Renaissance.

In Rome, where he saw the works of Michael Angelo and Raphael, he felt the quickening of his soul for the sacred and classical ideal, and began his scriptural scene 'The Blood-stained Coat of Joseph' and his classical allegory 'The Forge of Vulcan.' On his return to Spain he painted 'Christ at the Column' and a 'Crucifixion'—compositions which show a remarkable change of feeling. These two pictures, with the 'Madonna' in the Prado Gallery and the 'Reception of St. Francis Borgia,' are perhaps the finest specimens of Velazquez' work, and beyond these the subject of his art scarcely interests. But his wonderful mastery of realism so impresses us that we scarcely miss the ideal in his pictures. His art is the most individualist of all the art of the world. His power to reflect upon his canvas what the eye sees in nature has never been equalled or surpassed.

The impression made upon us by the art of his great contemporary, Murillo, is very different. Velazquez gives the impassioned impression in potent striking realism. Murillo paints realism also, but he animates it and leaves it instinct with life and emotion. Murillo may not seem as forceful in his realism as Velazquez, but his realism is more impressive, because it has a charm of feeling that is always tender and appealing.

After Raphael and Michael Angelo, perhaps, Murillo is the greatest genius in the history of art. The needy circumstances of his early life at Seville deprived him of all these advantages of travel and experience that contribute so largely towards the advance of individual effort, and threw him entirely upon his own natural resources. He knew nothing of the wonderful achievements of the Italian painters of the Renaissance, and he was dependent for his success upon his own extraordinary abilities. A short visit to Madrid, where he made a close study of the works of Vandyck, Titian, and Rubens, was all that his circumstances would allow, but it was sufficient to stimulate his soul and to awaken him to a sense of his own great powers. His return to Seville, where in early years he had gained the reputation of an artist of promise, marks a new phase in Murillo's career. In the ready generosity of the ecclesiastics he found the patronage to which he had aspired. At the Franciscan monastery he began a series of paintings, the wonderful success of which established his reputation and placed him in the front rank of the artists of the day.



Seville soon became proud of him, and commissions were poured in upon him sufficient to retain his services in the city for many years. He worked for all the churches, religious bodies and institutions. He painted with extraordinary ease, yet no brush has ever effected such rapid execution. It would be difficult to enumerate all the works of Murillo. It is said that no other artist has so many remarkable paintings to his name.

There are beautiful examples of Murillo's art in all the galleries of the world, but it is at Seville that we find his greatest masterpieces. The museum of his native city contains twenty-three of his paintings, amongst which is his favourite picture, 'St. Thomas of Villanova.' In the hospital of 'La Caridad' there are six immense compositions, two of which—'The Thirst' and the 'Christ Feeding the Multitude'—would be sufficient to establish any artist's fame. In one of the side chapels of the Cathedral of Seville is 'The Vision of St. Antony,' in which the saint is represented with hands outstretched towards the Holy Infant, who appears in a glory of cloud and light surrounded by angels. This is Murillo's masterpiece, and it has been classed by connoisseurs with the greatest picture in the world, Raphael's 'Transfiguration.' It is exquisitely beautiful in composition and feeling, and is painted in that wonderful mellowness of colouring for which this great Spanish master is unsurpassed. It is one of the most impressive pictures in the world. It has all the charm of a beautiful poem. It appeals to us; it holds us spellbound.

Murillo painted from types of southern Spain. He transferred their beauty to his canvases in powerful and realistic touches, but under his marvellous brush they became beings of a spiritual world. He was by nature a painter of religious subjects. A gentle and refined disposition and a deeply religious temperament contributed to that extraordinary mastery of sacred art in which he rivals the greatest genius of the Italian Renaissance. Murillo is not only the most popular of the Spanish painters, he is also the most gifted. He is one of the greatest exponents of all that is grand and noble in art. In his painting he has touched the most perfect chord of harmony in beauty of technique and charm of conception.

This short review of the lives and the life-work of some of the most celebrated of the Spanish painters, whose labours led up through the years of development and

transition to that period when the native genius succeeded in creating a school of art that was distinctly and essentially national, shows the influence of the Catholic Church in the whole artistic life of Spain. It was an influence that manifested itself principally in that practical interest in the progress of art which shall, forever, claim respect and admiration, and for which her one reward has been to secure for the world those works of gifted genius which, were it not for her munificent patronage, would never have been known to posterity.

E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.



# DR. MURRAY OF MAYNOOTH

BY REV. E. J. QUIGLEY

## VI

IN some quarters it was held that Maynooth taught Gallican doctrine; that in Maynooth very rigid Gallican moral theology and very anti-papal dogmatic teachings prevailed. The anti-Irish propaganda spread the lies; but they were as gospel in many continental colleges. The evidence given at the Royal Commissions of Maynooth, in 1826 and in 1856, proved the falseness of those accusations, and yet they were repeated in the *Dublin Review* as late as the year 1879. In a reply in the January 1880 number of the *Review* a very finished, able and conclusive reply was given by a member of Maynooth College. It shows that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was taught in the college for forty years prior to Murray's work. A long line of proof and testimony is given by the writer to prove that although Murray merits the praises given by the attack, that the censures heaped on his predecessors were excessive and false, and that Murray and his associate professors continued the teachings of their predecessors, but were no pioneers of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility in Maynooth teachings. At the Vatican Council—as a letter to Dr. Murray from one of the Bishops in attendance stated—all the Irish and many other English-speaking Bishops had at hand and in head Murray's work, *De Ecclesia Christi*, consulted it, and were proud of it and its author. Archbishop Manning—who wrote: 'In the Vatican Council, no saint had so many united sons as St. Patrick'<sup>1</sup>—was loud in praise of the work.

As this is Dr. Murray's greatest work, it may be interesting to note that it met with criticism in point of style. Purists rage at its Latinity. But every schoolboy knows their rage at St. John's Greek. Why is Dr. Murray so

<sup>1</sup> Manning's *Miscellanies*, vol. i. p. 387.

diffusive, so redundant, even so tautological? Because it is praiseworthy, and permitted by the rhetoricians to be so, in explanatory work. Labouring to be brief means obscurity, and obscurity in a theological work is a deadly sin. Why does he condescend to answer such rubbish as Hugh McNeille, Edward Gibson and Gayer; surely they and their stuff are beneath notice? A good treatise neglects nothing, and these men had certain lines, and their works, though low and superficial, contained venom. They were popular and widespread. The Professor was giving what the makers of modern mathematical textbooks claim to do: 'an exhaustive line of worked-out examples, which aid pupils in understanding the rules and in solving problems.'

At the Vatican Council another Irishman, Cardinal Cullen, took an active part.

His first discourse in defence of the prerogatives of the Holy See, mainly on historical grounds, in reply to the Bishop of Rottenburg, was regarded as one of the ablest discourses delivered in the Council. At its close the hall resounded with applause, and during the afternoon about eighty Bishops called at the Irish College to present their congratulations. . . . Towards the close of the sessions of the Council, at the express wish of the Central Commission, conveyed in person through its Secretary, Archbishop Franchi, Cardinal Cullen proposed the precise and accurate formula for the definition of Papal Infallibility. It was a matter of great delicacy, as promoters of the definition were split up into various sections, some anxious to assign a wider range to the Pope's decisions, while others would set forth in a somewhat indefinite way the Papal prerogative. All accepted the form of definition proposed by Cardinal Cullen, and thus it became the privilege of the Irish Church to have formulated for all time the solemn definition of this great article of faith.<sup>1</sup>

Two Irishmen were famous at the Council, Cardinal Cullen and Dr. Murray.

Dr. Murray loved, with a great and mighty love, his *Alma Mater*. Her name and fame were dear to him. But dearer far were her children. In their college days, every student called the old saint and savant 'Paddy Murray.' They loved him for his zeal, his learning, and the interest which he took in them individually. In letters sent to me past pupils laud him to the skies. They tell of his buoyancy, his kindness to the weak students, his kindness to the in-trouble students, and his memory of and interest in past students. They tell how he inquired about past pupils, priests on the

<sup>1</sup> *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. iv., 'Cullen.'



mission, how he could greet them by name in the city, ten and twenty years after their departure from the college, how he visited former pupils in very friendly ways, how he sent them books, how he loved them all, the great and glorious, even the wretched and the fallen. Some think he was vainglorious and proud of his fame, because when quoting opinions he used to add, 'Quid docet Murray?' 'Sic docet Murray,' and used to quote a phrase which Murray, lifting it from Caramuel, the butt of Pascal, applied to himself, 'I am a tub of theology!' I quoted the opinion of Carlyle about Dr. Murray: here we see the opinions of students, and here is how he appeared to a peasant:—

I knew him well, and used to go to Confession to him in Clones chapel, when he came home at Christmas. He used to hear in the vestry and always said at the end of the confession: 'God bless you, lad, say your prayers carefully!' But he had not *much power*. He had taken an oath to the Queen, and boys and men in trouble [secret society men] had to walk to Kingscourt to Confession or not go at all. He used to say Mass here in summer, on some Sundays. I remember him preaching on the Blood of Christ shed for us. He was a fine speaker and very easy to understand, but not near as good as Father McBride, the missionary [a Vincentian]. At the big mission at K., thousands and thousands attended for the three weeks, and the parish priest,—he was a terrible man—when Dr. Murray arrived out of Clones, put him down into X's barn to teach all the poor wanderers, fools, and cripples and ignorant creatures how to say their prayers and go to Confession. He spent three or four hours at that every day for a week, just teaching Catechism. He used to be afraid after night in the dark, and men used to walk with him past the 'ghosty' place. One night it was wee boys was with him and he gave them money and medals, and told them a story about Huddin and Duddin and Donal O'Leary. . . . The parish priest and Dr. Murray were great friends, and he would say, 'Well, Paddy, how is your flock to-day? How many did you put through their theology for the holy fathers to-day?' It sounded 'quare' to hear a priest spoken to that way.

But it was great training for the college don. He] understood, from personal and varied practice, the parts of penance treatises dealing with *rudes*, *surdi*, *semi-fatui*.

Dr. Murray was a model of method in his work, in his priestly life, and in detail. His little note-books are studies in neatness and exactness. He kept a strict account of income and outlay: his railway fare to Dublin, his clothing account, his servant's pay, his charity gifts to institutions—and they were many and large—all are noted. He was a man of zeal, industry and of high standards of conduct and duty. His aim was ever to put such standards before his beloved students, and just as Napoleon tried to inspire his troops

with love of France and her Eagles, so the Professor wished to inspire his young priests with the love of God and their college, that no act of theirs might shame or sully their calling or their college's name. 'Remember, your duty is to save the Eagles of France'—*Souvenez vous qu'il s'agit de sauver les aigles Françaises*. 'Soldiers of the National Guard, soldiers of my Imperial Guard, I entrust to your hands the Imperial Eagle. You swear that it will always be your guiding sign, your rallying point!' 'We swear, we swear.'<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Murray used no such flamboyant rhetoric, gave no glittering eagle, but to the young and enthusiastic priests he gave as his legacy, as a parting gift, something that was to be for many their guiding sign, their rallying point. He gave to each four little printed papers to fit into their breviaries. Here are the precious documents:—

MONITA QUAEDAM IN USUM PRAESERTIM EORUM QUI JAMJAM ORDINANDI SUNT PRESBYTERI ET AD VINEAM DOMINI EXCOLLENDAM PROPECTURI.

I. Haec quotidie petenda sunt et etiam saepius in die:—1°. Omnium peccatorum vestrorum venia; 2°. Gratia nunquam posthac ullum peccatum deliberatum committendi, maxime grave; 3°. Ut quotidie proficiatis in odio peccati et in amore Dei et B.V. Mariae; 4°. Ut tempore mortis omnia ultima sacramenta mentis compotes ac digne recipiatis; 5°. Perseverantia finalis!<sup>2</sup>

II. Frequenter in die, quibus negotiis distenti et semper nocte e somno excitati, attolite mentas vestras in caelum, preces quas vocant ejaculatorias effundendo.

III. Confessionem hebdomadalem, nisi casua gravi urgente nunquam intermittite.

IV. Ab omni motu ultionis deliberato quacumque offensa illata, strenue cavete.

V. Quatuor novissima crebro recolite.

VI. Lectioni librorum spiritualium sedulo incumbite. In istis pabula doctrinae salutaris omnigena invenietis, quibus ut cibis diurnis uti possitis et ad vestras animas alendas et animas eorum quorum curam utrumque habebitis, maxime autem in sacro Poenitentiae tribunali.

'Tantum illud vos rogo, ut ad Domini altare memineritis mei, ubi ubi fueritis.'<sup>3</sup>

December, 1870.

P. M.

How many thoughts were awakened in the minds of

<sup>1</sup> *The War Drama of the Eagles*, pp. 370, 371.

<sup>2</sup> Preces pro bono morte, quae utpote brevissimae facile memoriae mandari possunt, vid. apud 'Raccolta' nn. 6, 19, 187. Aliae sunt paulo longiores, ibid. n. 131, 132, item n. 84 (feria 3) 126 (oratio 3), 125 (sabb.). Vid. indulgentias singulis istis precibus annexas.

<sup>3</sup> St. Augustine, *Confessions*, l. 9, c. 11



former Maynooth students as in their breviaries they saw this reminder of their college, of their student zeal and fervour, and of their old Professor, kind and thoughtful? <sup>1</sup>

His college, his students, and the priesthood of Ireland, were very dear to the soul of Dr. Murray. Criticism of them was for him something very bitter. One day from his rostrum he read to his students the words of Cardinal Barnabo, Prefect of the Propaganda. They stung. They were from an eminent man, who was not over-cordial with Irish Bishops, and who was not loved by them with an overweening love. When the old Professor read them, he cried bitterly to see published broadcast the shortcomings of his beloved college and pupils.

Haec et similia defectui ecclesiastici spiritus in non paucis e clero tribuenda sunt, quod quidem in sententia virorum omni exceptione majorum, atque in Hibernensibus rebus peritorum ab imperfecta seminariorum directione est referendum. Non defuerunt clerici Hibernenses in majoribus istius Regni Collegiis instituti et alumni dum essent habiti tanquam optimi, qui satis superque ostenderunt se non solum spiritu ecclesiasticae vocationis sed vel ipsa notione obligationum sui status esse destitutos.

It may be noted that years before Cardinal Barnabo's letter was written, Dr. Murray had given to his students the *Monita*, printed above. During the last decade of his life, his pen was not idle. He was preparing the second edition of his work, *De Ecclesia*, for the press; his tract on Grace was written; his volume on Matrimony and on the Veneration of Images was being corrected and enlarged. But visitors to the college, past students, acquaintances, and friends, were noticing the change which was coming over the buoyant spirit and the bodily vigour of the beloved professor. Death had diminished greatly the numbers in his home circle. His college contemporaries were dying off. In his college circle he mourned the loss of his dear friend and constant companion for nearly fifty years, Dr. George Crolly. They were 'immediates' in class; Crolly being No. 3 and Murray No. 4 on the class rolls of 1829. During the long illness of Dr. Crolly in Dublin, the Maynooth professors and students saw the wonderfully strong love that Dr. Murray had for his dying colleague. In the following year, 1879, Dr. O'Hanlon, who had been Dr. Murray's professor, died rather suddenly, and in a few months, Dr. Murray was a lonely

<sup>1</sup> See *I. E. RECORD*, January, 1884.

old man, sad and silent. Death called away his dear and noble friend Dr. Russell, the noblest priest in Ireland.

The writer of Dr. Murray's obituary notice remarks :—

Of late years the old Professor had become very retiring in his habits ; he seldom spoke much in the presence of strangers, but to his fellow-professors he was kind and gentle as ever. He always treated them, even the youngest of them, with unvarying kindness and courtesy, was ready to give them assistance in difficult questions, and he listened with the greatest respect to the opinions of those who had no claim to his vast learning and experience. More than all, he was a man of great simplicity of character, strong faith and generous piety. He spent his leisure hours of late years for the most part alone in constant communion with God through prayer. It is noteworthy that the last thing he wrote was a short paper on Purgatory which appeared in the *Ecclesiastical Record* for last August (1881). 'Every work,' he says, 'even the smallest, has its reward ; it is expiatory as well as meritorious.'

In that last essay Dr. Murray shows all his best points of style and matter. Its neat, well-formed sentences, its simplicity, its clearness and exactness of form prove that the old Professor's mental energy was not diminished.

In that very month of August, he visited for the last time his dear old home, in his old town of Clones. Everyone noticed his changed appearance, the weakness of his voice, his slow gait, his sallow sunken cheek. His work in college was not too severe. He was Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, the highest honour his college could give. His priest-friends wished him to resign his chair, to live with his beloved sister, his sole remaining relative. To the meeting of the Bishops in October, 1881, he tendered his resignation, but they wished to honour their professor, they wished that death alone should lead the old man from the work he loved. His resignation was refused and temporary provision made for the discharge of his duties, if he were unable to lecture. He struggled nobly in pain and weakness to give his lectures. Sometimes he was unable to leave his rooms. When he walked in the parks he was alone, leaning heavily on his huge walking stick. How his mind and memory must have worked in those quiet walks around the college grounds. What changes he had seen. He had entered the college when everything was poor and mean and squalid. He had lived to see the dawn of Maynooth's glory. He had seen students and professors fettered with Government restrictions, spied upon and lied upon. Maynooth, in his life's decline, was free. One of his dreams of glory was to see good diocesan colleges



to feed Maynooth with well-trained youths. He lived to see such, and to see the standardized knowledge and training which the then young Intermediate Education was giving to Catholic colleges. Writing to Father Russell, S.J., in 1892, the Most Rev. Dr. Brownrigg says :—

These lessons and examples from superiors and professors were constantly before the eyes of Maynooth students in the olden times, as they, thank God, are still ; and they were not confined to any one, two, or three members of the governing or teaching staff of the college, but shone forth brightly in the lives of all—Crolly, Murray, Callan, O’Kane, McCarthy, etc., etc. These good and great men, but notably amongst them Dr. Russell, had more to do in forming the character of that generation of Irish priests, who are now getting into the sere and yellow leaf of life, than these have perhaps known or admitted to themselves. And the work was established not so much in the lecture or class hall, as by the unvarying, uniform, blessed example of ecclesiastical virtue and character which was constantly held up before the eyes of the students in the daily lives of those saintly and learned men. It is this nameless and subtle influence of the virtues and noble endowments of its teachers and superiors that chiefly invests any college with the sacred, tender, and beneficent character of *Alma Mater* . . . the walks and games enjoyed with so much zest ; the long winter’s evenings over the fire in the class halls, during the hours of recreation ; the ebullitions of racy Irish ‘genius,’ wit and humour ; the mysterious workings of the Infirmary and the sick list and the still more mysterious doings of the pharmacopœia, and ‘old Sam’ ; the various systems of ‘navigation’ taught and practised by able professors of that science ; the jokes and pranks and humours of the physics hall, under the old Doctor ; the saintly and self-confident air of the ‘safe’ man ; the terror and dismay of ‘radical’ on the eve of the order list—all these and many other scenes ‘grave and gay’ have flitted before my mind while writing to you.

Hence, the Maynooth of forty or fifty years ago resembled closely the Maynooth of to-day. And men of those years, perhaps, may find a pleasure in reading these essays on the days of Murray.

Biographers insist ever on the virtues and perfections of their subject ; and all too seldom let their readers see the human weakness of the person portrayed. Readers who read carefully Mr. Wilfred Ward’s biographies of Newman and Wiseman, and his theory and system of studying and writing biography, can see that what marks his work with the note of distinction is his fairness, his impartiality, and his honesty in showing the strength and weakness of his illustrious subjects. Nearly all men are affected by praise or by flattery ; Murray was no exception. The crude practitioner in administering praise and flattery on the subject of Dr. Murray’s pre-eminence as an essayist, as a professor,

as a theological writer never tried to repeat the dose. The Professor was very alert in stopping the beginnings of such unmannerly speech. But, just as Gladstone was stupidly proud of his labours in theological literature and polemics, reckoning his success in these subjects far beyond his success in politics, so Dr. Murray was proud of his singing and his poetry. He rejoiced to hear praise of his rendering of one of Moore's *Melodies*, of his liturgical singing. And men tell that he sang metallicly and huskily. He beamed with delight to hear priests sing his 'Song for the Pope,' and when thousands of children in National Schools in Ireland were reading his poem 'Glandore,' the Professor preferred such publicity to all the praise and laudation of the learned clergy of Christendom. His poetry is respectable verse, but hardly first-rate poetry. His little volume of poems he dedicated to 'My sister, Teresa Murray'; and on its publication he sent a copy to his friend, Aubrey De Vere, who wrote in reply:—

*Wednesday, April 24th, 1867.*

DEAR DR. MURRAY,

Pray accept my best thanks for the little volume you have been so kind as to send me. I promise myself great pleasure in the reading of it; but do not like to delay in telling you with what pleasure I have already read all the poems it contains. They seem to me to be full of beauty both of thought and expression. I find that those to which I have prefixed especial marks are the following, viz.: 'The Rock of Cashel' 'Bundoran,' 'Cordis Suspiria,' 'Vox Dilecti,' 'From the Life of St. Teresa,' 'The Close of a Long Task'—and I have no doubt that I shall enjoy them yet more on a second reading.

Believe me,

Very truly yours,

AUBREY DE VERE.

The poem referred to in the above letter, 'The Close of a Long Task,' was written when Dr. Murray had finished his immense labours of arranging, composing, writing, and correcting the proofs of his work on the Church. It was written in August, 1866, and is his finest poem.

At length is realized thy dream—  
That cherished dream of other years :  
And toils, though but just ended, seem  
Long past, like boyhood's joys and tears.

Lay gently down thy weary pen,  
And the last page press softly on,  
With lowly bended forehead then  
Thank God for all that He hath done.



And pray that if thy feeble hand  
 Through Him hath builded true and strong,  
 Hath made the cause of right to stand  
 And struck to earth the cause of wrong,

Hath woven round the mystic brow  
 One pure though slender wreath of love,  
 So yet the wreath of glory thou  
 Mayest wear in the great Church above.

If Thy creating grace, O Lord,  
 Hath stamped a worth, where none would be,  
 I ask for, wish for, no reward,  
 Save Thee, O Lord, save only Thee.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Murray's best known poem is not mentioned in the selection named by Aubrey De Vere, because it is not his best effort. But it had great merit, and enjoyed great and widespread popularity, on account of its theme, its author, and the time of publication. The champion of the Papacy published 'A Song for the Pope' when the Press of the world prophesied the early death and burial of the Papacy, and the extinction of the Church which claimed indefectibility. The poet sang:—

A song for the Pope, for the Royal Pope,  
 Who rules from the sea to sea,  
 Whose Kingdom or Sceptre never can fail—  
 What a grand old King is he!  
 No warrior hordes hath he, with their swords,  
 His rock-built throne to guard:  
 For against it the gates of hell shall war  
 In vain, as they ever have warred.

Great dynasties die, like flowers in the field;  
 Great empires rise and fall;  
 Glories that have been, that blazed to the stars;  
 They have been—and that is all!  
 But there is the grand old Roman See,  
 The ruins of earth among,  
 Young with the youth of its early prime,  
 With the strength of Peter strong.

Over all the orb no land so true  
 Than our own old Catholic land,  
 Through ages of blood, to the Rock hath stood—  
 True may she ever stand!  
 O ne'er may the star St. Patrick set  
 On her radiant brow decay.  
 Hurrah for the grand old Catholic isle!  
 For the grand old Pope, hurra!

<sup>1</sup> 'Non aliam mercedem quam teipsum, Domine.'

But poets and professors are mortal. There is no land of  $\tau\eta\ \eta\alpha\ \eta\text{-}\delta\varsigma$ . Fatal illness gripped the old man and he was suffering intense pain. In a few weeks, the doctors in attendance pronounced his case hopeless. Internal cancer, agonizing and incurable, had laid fast hold on the poor old man. When he realized he was doomed, he wrote to his beloved sister :—

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE,

April 21st, 1882.

MY DEAREST SISTER,

The reason why I did not wish you to come sooner was that the eight or ten months I may have got to live would be a weary time for you, stopping. You may come on Monday morning, 23rd. I write this in bed ; I am in great pain. Dr. Macaulay says Mass for me here [probably in his room] every Sunday morning.

Your ever loving brother,

P. MURRAY.

It was his last letter, the last time he used a pen. And the arrival of the letter in Clones was the first time that I, a small boy, heard of Dr. Murray. Miss Teresa Murray was then a grey-haired old lady, very neat, very prim, and very kind. She kept the most beautiful shop in my, then, world. The counter to the left-hand side was presided over by her nephew, a handsome man, everybody's friend. He was a chemist and a member of the Pharmaceutical Society, had rows of bottles, jars, glass cases, on his shelves. Michael, my mate, and I often visited him behind his compounding screen. But hearing of a man named Owen Roe O'Neill, who, we heard, was a great fighting-man against Protestants in olden times, and who got poison through his boots, we resolved never to stand near the press labelled POISON. For if poison got into a man's boots, it was possible it might enter ours with fatal results ! The right-hand counter and shelves were regulated by Miss T. Murray, and beautiful they were. There were scores of trains, carriages, tops, drums, whips, marbles, Noah's Arks, wooden horses, bugles, squealers, etc. She allowed us two to roam freely through her varied treasures. When she went out to Confession on Saturdays we guarded the treasures till her return. Sometimes we found her reading, sometimes praying, sometimes knitting, sometimes writing letters. But we were always welcome, always received with a smile. But one day she was in tears. We had never seen grown-up people weep. The sight shocked us, and when she told us that her brother was very ill and dying, we said we



were sorry and that we would pray for him, and for her not to cry. But the tears came. She knew that death cannot be avoided. He was her joy, her idol, her companion. But little she thought that for her there was to be a long lonely life of thirty years.

To Maynooth she went to see her dying brother. In his college he wished to die. She urged him to go with her to die in his childhood's home. It was useless to urge. He loved and longed for Heaven, and its portals were, to his mind, Maynooth. The summer of 1882 found him sinking slowly, racked with pain, patient, ever prayerful. Sometimes he asked the professors to read to him. Sometimes students read. One of those who read to him writes :—' He knew the *Imitation of Christ* by heart, and always asked us to begin our reading to him with the chapter, "The Royal Road of the Cross!" The Gospels and the Books of Wisdom and Psalms were his favourite books. Now and then he would groan with pain, and ejaculatory prayer was ever on his lips.'

By times he had his bed drawn near the window to see the grounds, the students, the green trees. During the holidays he was lifted into a wheel chair and brought round the beloved walks in the college parks. He begged to be brought over to the cemetery to see the graves of his old professors, and of his beloved Dr. Russell and Dr. Crotty. The autumn brought back the students. Few visitors were allowed to see the dying man, but every one in the college was praying for the poor old professor whom all called 'Paddy Murray.' Sometimes he rallied; sometimes he had days of agonizing pain; but he was always gentle, kind, considerate. The disease had reduced him to a skeleton, and at length on the 17th November, 1882, the soul of him who did so much for God, for the Church of God, and the Church of Ireland met God in judgment. In all his acts his motto and prayer were: 'Non aliam mercedem quam teipsum, Domine.' His reward was surely as he prayed. More than two thousand priests had been his pupils, and from many hearts and many altars went forth prayer and sacrifice for the soul of their old master, so kind, so considerate, so hardworking as a teacher, so zealous for their ideals and practice of priestly conduct and duty.

#### L'ENVOI

In concluding these essays I thank several priests who helped me with reminiscences, etc. I have tried to write a

plain unvarnished biography. I write of a person I never saw. And I have been guided by the ideas and practice of that prince of biographers, the late Mr. Wilfred Ward. In his *Last Lectures* (pp. 151, 152) he wrote:—

Now, in depicting individuality a writer must aim at what is practical and possible. He can hardly hope to penetrate to what Tennyson called the 'abysmal depth of personalty.' To speak first of biography, what the writer must attempt to do is to make the subject of his biography known to his reader, much as he would have been known to those who came across him in real life. He cannot do much more. He will have achieved signal success if he does so much. . . . In biography the great test of success in this respect is that all who knew the man should say, when they have read his life, 'This is the man we knew,' though they may differ in their estimate of him as they did while he still lived among them.

Perhaps some readers will let me know if I have carefully depicted the works and ways of this the man they knew.

E. J. QUIGLEY.



# THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN ST. IRENEUS

BY REV. EDWARD R. JAMES

IN the second century of the Christian era the Catholic Church was assailed by foes within and foes without her pale. While the Apologists—a name given to those defenders of the faith who endeavoured to clear Christians from the charge of crimes maliciously brought against them—were striving to turn aside external persecutions, other writers set themselves the task of refuting doctrinal errors, that threatened from within the life of the infant Church. There was, from the character of the times, but one way open to these defenders of the faith, and that was to insist on the traditional teaching of the Church. Innovations could then be opposed only by appealing to the teaching of the Apostles, which had been carefully and reverently transmitted from generation to generation. St. Irenæus is the earliest of these Antignostic Fathers, as they have been called, of whose works we have any considerable remains. By his nearness to the Apostolic times, as well as by his intercourse with the Churches of many lands, he is well qualified to testify to the teaching not only of the whole Church of his day, but also of the Church that immediately succeeded the Apostles.

Born, probably in Asia Minor, about the year A.D. 120, he was instructed in the faith in his early youth by the Martyr Bishop of Smyrna, St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Apostle. His letter to Florinus, who had become a Valentinian, shows how faithfully he adhered to the teaching of his first master, and throws a strong light on his frequent insistence on the tradition of the Elders:—

I can recall the very place [he says] where Polycarp used to sit and teach, his manner of speech, his mode of life, the sermons he addressed to the people, the frequent references to his familiar intercourse with St. John and others who had seen the Lord; how he used to repeat from memory their sayings, in fact, everything he had heard from them concerning the Lord. And he would relate to us everything concerning His

miracles and His doctrine, just as he had received it from them who had seen the Word of Life, wonderfully agreeing in all he said with the Holy Writ. These things, through the mercy of God, I hearkened to with great zeal, engraving them not on perishable material but on the tablets of my heart; and by the mercy of God I repeat and revolve them assiduously in my mind. And I can affirm in the presence of God that that holy and apostolic man, if he heard any such doctrines as you teach, would forthwith cry out, and stopping his ears would exclaim, as was his wont, 'Good God, why have you preserved me till now to hear such things as these!' And he would fly from the place where he heard such doctrine.<sup>1</sup>

When St. Ireneus went to Rome, he came under the influence of St. Justin, who, by his philosophical training in conflicting schools of thought, played no little part in moulding the mind and training the intelligence of the future Bishop of Lyons. When, about the year A.D. 177, the aged Bishop of Lyons, St. Pothinus, suffered martyrdom, his disciple and presbyter, St. Ireneus, was elected to succeed him. From this time onwards St. Ireneus found time amid his many missionary labours to write several treatises, chiefly against the Gnostics, of which the work 'Against Heresies' alone survives.

In St. Ireneus we have, perhaps, the most learned and most distinguished Bishop of his time, one whose testimony has this special value: that it gives us the traditional teaching of the whole Church, as it was handed down from the Apostles. In his references to the Holy Eucharist, his aim is not to prove that it is the real Body and Blood of Christ, for the Gnostics admit this, but to show that their tenets, that Christ is not the Word, the Son of the Creator of the world, and that our bodies do not rise again, are incompatible with what they believe concerning the Eucharist. His allusions to the Holy Eucharist are, therefore, for the most part indirect, and may easily be, as in fact they have been, distorted to prove that he denied the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar.

The latest attempt to exploit the testimony of St. Ireneus to bolster up the Protestant teaching on the Holy Eucharist is to be found in the recent work of Dr. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock on *Ireneus of Lugdunum*.<sup>2</sup> In the fifteenth chapter he writes: 'Ireneus did not speak of any physical change in the elements, or conceive Christ to be present in a corporeal manner in the Eucharist.'<sup>3</sup> 'His

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. *H.E.* v. 20.<sup>2</sup> Camb. Univ. Press, 1914.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 277.



emphatic assertion that the Eucharist consists of two realities (*ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων*), a heavenly and an earthly, shows that he was not aware of any such change as is implied by the term transubstantiation.<sup>1</sup> 'There is, consequently, "a line of deep cleavage" between the views of Irenæus, and those of the Roman Church on this subject.'<sup>2</sup> Again he says :—

Irenæus also followed his master [St. Justin] in referring Malachi's prophecy of a pure offering to the Eucharist . . . as a thank-offering of the fruits of the earth, and as a means of Communion with Christ, the Lord of Creation.<sup>3</sup> . . . The Eucharist was evidently, then, regarded by Irenæus as a sacrifice of the first fruits of the earth. The question is whether he considered the Sacrament of the Eucharist not only as an occasion of Communion with Christ, but also of pleading or presenting Him in sacrifice.<sup>4</sup>

After admitting that a disputed passage may possibly be sound, as cited in favour of this latter idea, he continues :—

It is also to be remembered that Irenæus insists on the permanence of this distinction between the two elements, the real and the heavenly, in the Lord's Supper, even after receiving the consecration of God. This distinction does not favour the view that the Word is offered in the Eucharist. He never says or implies that Christ is corporally or really offered there.<sup>5</sup> . . . [Irenæus] regarded the offering of the first fruits of the earth, the Christian *minkhah*, as the chief oblation of the Church.<sup>6</sup>

We may admit at the outset that St. Irenæus does not speak 'of any physical change in the elements'; but he refers to the Holy Eucharist in language that cannot possibly be explained, if this change is denied. Like St. Ignatius, and his master, St. Justin, he speaks simply and realistically on the Holy Eucharist as the Body and Blood of Christ, and says that we are nourished on His flesh. Aware of this, Dr. Hitchcock seems to deprecate the use of this realistic language; of course, St. Irenæus was only 'adopting the phrase of the day,' a practice that 'led to serious misunderstandings.' And then he quotes, with a naïve misunderstanding of its import, from a fragment of St. Irenæus, which says, 'the slaves informed their examiners that they heard their masters speaking of the Holy Communion (*Θεία μεταλήψις*) as the Body and Blood of Christ, thinking this was actually blood and flesh.'<sup>7</sup> We must bear in mind that St. Irenæus was not occupied, as

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 276.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 272.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 274.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. p. 280.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 270.

the schoolmen were, in framing a theory to explain the relation of the Eucharistic Body and Blood of Christ with the opinions of philosophers regarding material substance. All philosophical speculation on the mysteries of the faith is banned by him. As we have pointed out, and shall see as we proceed, his aim is not to prove that the Holy Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ; he assumes it to be the traditional teaching of the Church, held even by the Gnostics, and shows that the fantastic theories of his adversaries are irreconcilable with the Christian dogma. It would be absurd, therefore, to expect St. Ireneus to speak of the Holy Eucharist in terms that presuppose definite views on a philosophical question that had not then been broached. The time was not ripe for the use of such words as transubstantiation, change or conversion.

As the doctrine of St. Ireneus is based on the teaching of the Apostles, which he received from St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and is representative of the faith of the whole Church in the second century, it will be as profitable as it is interesting to try and get a complete view of the Venerable Doctor's teaching on the Holy Eucharist as sacrifice and sacrament.

In his letter to Pope Victor, St. Ireneus recalls an incident that happened to the Bishop of Smyrna, which reveals the fact that the chief liturgical function in the assembly of the faithful was the celebration of the Eucharist, of which the Bishop was the proper minister. When St. Polycarp went to Rome, he tells us, he was not only at peace with the Pontiff, but even honoured by him, though they both differed on the question of the Paschal feast and fast. In spite of their differences, 'they communicated with one another, and in the Church Anicetus gave to Polycarp, out of respect, (the office of celebrating) the Eucharist.'<sup>1</sup> Rufinus, in his translation of Eusebius, renders the words of St. Ireneus thus: '*communicarunt sibi invicem, ita ut cederet Anicetus Polycarpo etiam sacerdotali ministerio honoris dumtaxat contemplatione perfungi.*' The honour which the Pontiff showed to St. Polycarp was not that he admitted him to Holy Communion, but, as the translation of Rufinus shows, that he invited him to perform in his

<sup>1</sup> Euseb., *H.E.* v. 24, in Harvey, 11. 276. The quotations from 'Against Heresies' are taken from Harvey's Edition, the number of book and chapter being given from his marginal references to Massuet's Edition, which is better known.



stead the priestly function of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice in the assembly of the faithful. Where would the honour have been in this, if the celebration of the Eucharist were not the proper office of the Pope at Rome?

A few lines above this extract, St. Irenæus, referring to the custom of the Romans and their Asiatic pilgrims of observing Easter and the preceding fast on different days, says that in spite of this glaring contrast the members of the two observances remained at peace:—

And the presbyters before Sotor, who governed the Church over which you now preside, namely Anicetus, Pius, Hygnus, Telesphorus and Sixtus, did not observe (the quartodeciman pasch) or allow their subjects to observe it. Nevertheless, they were at peace with the faithful who came to them from Churches where this observance was in vogue, though it was openly opposed to their own practice. No one was ever ejected from the Church on this account; on the contrary, the presbyters, your predecessors, even *sent the Eucharist* to the quartodeciman Churches.

That there was a large number of Asiatic Christians in the Eternal City is evident from the fact that their custom was so noticeable in its contrast to the Roman practice. If, as is quite probable, Mass was celebrated in several Churches at the same time, we may assume that the Eastern Christians had presbyters of their own observance to preside over their liturgical functions. The words of St. Irenæus, then, 'they sent the Eucharist,' may refer either to the sending of Holy Communion to the faithful in their homes, or possibly to the custom of sending the *Fermentum*. There obtained in Rome, if not then, certainly at a not much later period, two kindred ceremonies, the *Sancta* and the *Fermentum*, which symbolized the unity of the Eucharist in point of time, and the Communion of the faithful in one and the same sacrifice. The *Sancta* was a fragment of the consecrated bread, reserved from the previous Mass, which the Pontiff dropped into the chalice at the words, *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*. The object of the ceremony was to symbolize the unity of the Mass with that previously celebrated, as well as the Communion of the faithful at both sacrifices, and so on back through the ages as long as the ceremony had existed. When the Pontiff was unable to celebrate in person, he appointed a presbyter to offer the Mass in his stead, and sent him a portion of the loaves consecrated at the previous pontifical Mass, which took the place of the *Sancta* and was put into the chalice at the same liturgical moment. This was called the *Fermentum*. A

notice in the life of Pope Zephyrinus, who ascended the papal chair a few months after the death of St. Ireneus, probably refers to this custom. The *Liber Pontificalis* tells us that this Pontiff ordained that the deputed presbyter should not proceed with the Mass, until he had received from the Bishop (i.e., the Pope) a consecrated *corona* or loaf.<sup>1</sup> How far back this ceremony existed, we do not know. Whether the words of St. Ireneus, then, refer to the *Fermentum*, or merely to the Holy Communion, it is plain that the Eucharist was then regarded, as in the days of St. Ignatius, as the symbol of unity.<sup>2</sup> The point of St. Ireneus' words is that by sending the Eucharist to the quartodeciman Christians in Rome, the Pope could not have given them a greater pledge that, in spite of minor differences, he still regarded them as brethren, united in one faith and one sacrifice.

Sacrifice implies an altar and a priesthood. The Christian priesthood belongs to all the faithful, but only in a corporate capacity; they partake of the sacrifice by bringing their gifts to the altar. In the words of St. Peter, they are a royal priesthood. It is to this that St. Ireneus refers when he writes, 'all the just have sacerdotal rank.' That the Apostles are priests in the same sense as the Levitical priests, that they offer to God a new oblation which replaces the sacrifices of the Old Law, and that this true and pure sacrifice, foretold by Samuel, David, Isaias and Malachi, is offered on an earthly altar, whence it is directed to the altar in heaven, is clearly taught by St. Ireneus. Referring to Our Lord's defence of His Apostles from the charge of breaking the Sabbath when they plucked ears of corn on that day, he shows that Christ regarded His Apostles as of the same rank as the Levitical priests.

Excusing His Apostles by the words of the law, and signifying that it is lawful for priests to act freely. . . . But all the Lord's Apostles are priests, for they possess here neither lands nor houses, but *always serve the altar* and God.<sup>3</sup> This is evidently an earthly altar, though the sacrifice there offered is directed to the altar in heaven. There is an altar in heaven, for thither our prayers and oblations are directed, and a temple and a tabernacle, as John says in the Apocalypse.<sup>4</sup>

Words that recall the prayer after consecration, 'jube haec offerri per manus angeli tui in sublime altare tuum.'<sup>4</sup>

The character of the Eucharistic sacrifice is nowhere

<sup>1</sup> See *Ordo Romanus Primus*, Atchley, 1905, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> St. Ign. ad Phil. n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> IV. 8. 3.

<sup>4</sup> IV. 18. 6.



defined in set terms by St. Irenæus; but his teaching on the subject will be best gathered from a few extracts, in which he contrasts the new sacrifice with the sacrifices of the Old Law.

When he saw them neglecting justice and abandoning the love of God, thinking that by their sacrifices they propitiate God, Samuel spoke to them thus: 'God does not desire holocausts and sacrifices, but that His voice should be obeyed; behold, obedience is better than sacrifice and the fat of rams.' David also said: 'sacrifice and oblation thou didst not desire, but thou has perfected (pierced) my ears: holocausts for sin thou didst not demand.' Teaching them that God desires obedience, which is of service to them, rather than sacrifices and holocausts, which are of no avail to justice, at the same time prophesying the New Testament.

A few lines further down he writes:—

Lest one should think that He rejected their sacrifices, because He was angry, He adds, giving them counsel, 'sacrifice to God a sacrifice of praise,' etc.; rejecting the sacrifices whereby sinners think they propitiate God, he exhorts and admonishes (them to offer) those sacrifices by which man is justified and approaches to God.

Again, quoting Isaias i. 11-18, he says:—

For, not as man is moved, as some dare to say, does (God) turn away from their sacrifices; but having pity on their blindness, He insinuates *a true sacrifice, with which they who offer will propitiate God*, that they may receive life from Him.<sup>1</sup>

That St. Irenæus is here referring to the Eucharistic sacrifice and not merely to the inner sacrifices of the heart, is evident, for he goes on to say that this true, propitiatory sacrifice is the pure oblation foretold by Malachi, which is the Holy Eucharist.

But [Our Lord] giving counsel to His disciples to offer to God the first fruits of His creatures, not as to one in need, but that they themselves might be neither fruitless nor thankless, took bread, which is of Creation, and gave thanks, saying, 'This is My Body.' And the cup likewise, which is of the same creation as ourselves, He confessed to be His Blood, and taught the new oblation of the new Covenant. This the Church received from the Apostles and offers throughout the world to God who gives us food as the first fruits of His gifts in the new Testament, of which Malachi among the twelve (minor) prophets thus prophesied: 'My pleasure is not in you, saith the Lord Almighty, and I will not receive a sacrifice from your hands. For from the rising of the sun to the going down My Name is glorified among the nations and in every place incense is offered to Me and a pure sacrifice; for My Name is great among the nations, saith the Lord Almighty'; most clearly signifying by these words that the former people shall cease to offer to God, yet in every place a sacrifice is offered and that a pure one, and that His Name is glorified among the nations.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> IV. 17. 1.

<sup>2</sup> IV. 17. 5.

The mention of the Eucharist in connexion with Our Lord's counsel to offer the first fruits to God, would seem at first sight to indicate that St. Ireneus saw in the sacrifice of the New Law merely a Christian *minkhah*, an offering of bread and wine, representing the fruits of the earth; but his words are not strictly conclusive that he regarded the new oblation solely as such. The reason why he associated the Jewish ceremony with the Christian sacrifice may possibly be found in the fact that Our Lord instituted the Eucharist a few days before the rite of offering in the temple the wave-sheaf, the first fruits of the year. On that memorable night, so tradition may have said, Christ, referring to the coming ceremony, 'gave counsel to His Apostles to offer to God the first fruits of His creatures.' As long as this ceremony was fresh in the minds of the primitive Christians, this lesson of Our Lord would tend to unite in their thoughts the Jewish *minkhah* and the new oblation, which took the place of the old sacrifices. Be that as it may, St. Ireneus plainly teaches that the Eucharist replaces all the old sacrifices, especially those whereby men thought to propitiate God for their sins. In his eyes, the Eucharist is a true and pure sacrifice, which, in contrast to the old, is of avail to justice, propitiates God, and brings man nearer to Him.

It was perhaps with this thought in his mind that St. Ireneus wrote: 'Therefore, *coming to His passion*, . . . when, holding the cup, He had given thanks and drunk of it and had given to His disciples, He said to them, "Drink ye all of this. This is My Blood of the new Covenant, which shall be shed for many *unto the remission of sins*."' <sup>1</sup> It is not quite clear whether St. Ireneus here associates the Eucharist with the Passion, as the unbloody renewal of the sacrifice of the cross, for the remission of sins, or merely connects them in point of time. In III. 16-7 he writes: 'Wherefore, when Mary was eager for the admirable sign of wine and wished before the time to partake of the cup of "recapitulation" (*compendii poculo*), the Lord, checking her untimely haste, said,' etc. The word *compendii*, according to Harvey, here involves ἀνακεφαλαιώσεως, a word that figures largely in the theology of St. Ireneus, and refers to the 'symbolical character of the cup of the Eucharist, as setting forth the Saviour evidently crucified to the eye of



faith.' 'The cup, that *recapitulates* the sufferings of Christ, was manifestly *intempestivam* before the Passion of Our Lord.'<sup>1</sup> Perhaps St. Irenæus would also have regarded the Eucharist as replacing the Paschal sacrifice, for he tells us that the Passion of Christ (which the cup of the Eucharist recapitulates) was the fulfilment of the Pasch. *Passus est Dominus adimplens Pascha.*<sup>2</sup>

Further light will be thrown on St. Irenæus' conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice by the following passages, which require some little comment:—

It behoves us to offer an oblation to God and in all things to be found grateful to God, our Maker, with pure mind and faith unfeigned, with firm hope and fervent love, offering the first fruits of His creatures. This pure oblation the Church alone offers to God, offering Him of His creatures with thanksgiving. But the Jews do not now offer, for their hands are full of blood, because they received not the Word, who (*or*, through whom [the oblation]) is offered to God; *non enim receperunt verbum [per] quod offertur [Deo].*<sup>3</sup>

The words *per* and *Deo* are doubtful. If *per* be retained, the mind of St. Irenæus is that Christ is the real consecrating priest in the Eucharist. Compare IV. 17-6. 'In Deo omnipotente *per* Jesum Christum offert Ecclesia.' If *per* be cancelled, then it is the Word of God, and not merely the material element of the sacrifice, representing the fruits of the earth, that is offered. Whether this view is tenable in face of St. Irenæus' assertion that 'the Eucharist consists of two elements, an earthly and a heavenly,' we shall consider later on.

How will they be assured that the bread that has been consecrated is the Body of their Lord, and the chalice is the chalice of His Blood, if they do not call Him the Son of the World's Creator, that is, His Word, through Whom the tree bears fruit, the fountains flow, and the earth gives forth first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear? How, again, can they say that the flesh goes to corruption and shares not in life, that has been nourished on the Body and the Blood of the Lord? Either, then, let them change their view, or abstain from offering the aforesaid sacrifice. But our view is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our view. We offer to Him His own, fittingly announcing the fellowship and union of flesh and spirit. For as the bread, which is of the earth, on receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two elements, an earthly and a heavenly, so our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are now incorruptible and have the hope of the resurrection to eternity.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Harvey, II. pp. 44 and 88.

<sup>2</sup> IV. 10. 1.

<sup>3</sup> IV. 18. 4.

<sup>4</sup> IV. 18. 4 and 5.

That the Eucharist, which nourishes our bodies and is offered in sacrifice, is the Body and Blood of Christ, both Gnostics and Catholics believed. But, inconsistently with this belief, says St. Ireneus, the Gnostics maintained that the Christ was not the Son of God who made the world, but of a Superior Being. The Catholic view, on the contrary, is in harmony with their teaching of the Eucharist. For, if the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, this depends on the fact that Our Lord has power over the material creation. But He would not have this power, if He were Son of a God other than the Maker of the world. The fact, therefore, that the bread and wine have, by the invocation of God, become the Body and Blood of Christ, proves that Our Lord has this power, and hence must be the Son of the World's Creator. 'They must, therefore, change their view, or cease to offer the Eucharist.' In other words, if they will not admit that Christ is the Son of God who made the world, they must abstain from offering the sacrifice, for that which they offer is the Body and Blood of Christ. This seems to be the underlying argument of St. Ireneus; but it is not his argument as such that here concerns us, but the undersigned proof that St. Ireneus does imply that 'Christ is corporally and really offered there.'

The second part of his argument leads to the same realism in his view of the Eucharist as a sacrament. Our bodies, he says, are now incorruptible and have the hope of the resurrection, because they are nourished with the Eucharist, which consists of two elements, an earthly and a heavenly. That the earthly element is bread and wine, while the heavenly element is the Christ spiritually received, is certainly not the thought of St. Ireneus. 'Quid est ergo terrenum? Plasma. Quid autem coeleste? Spiritus.'<sup>1</sup> A word on the psychology of St. Ireneus will help to explain his argument. The earthly, imperfect man, who by the fall lost incorruptibility and immortality, consists of body and soul only. The perfect man, on the contrary, is a spiritual man, not because he is an incorporeal spirit, but because he has the spirit of God in him. He consists of body, soul, and spirit. It is the spirit that gives incorruptibility and immortal life. Thus is spirit united in fellowship with flesh, as the cause of incorruptibility.<sup>2</sup> In the Eucharist, then, we receive Christ, the vivifying Word of God,

<sup>1</sup> V. 9. 3. Cf. V. 7. 1. Plasma, id est caro.

<sup>2</sup> See V. cc. 7, 8, and 9.



who is not only man, having a body and soul like ours—the earthly element,—but is also ‘a quickening Spirit,’ the ‘Spirit of the Father,’ and, therefore, ‘the bread of immortality’ (for it is the spirit that giveth life, the flesh alone profiteth nothing)—the heavenly element. Therefore our bodies, by receiving Him in this ‘incorruptible banquet,’ are sown with the seed of immortality and will rise incorruptible in the resurrection to come. The same ideas underlie the following passage:—

[Our Lord] might have come to us in His unspeakable glory, but we could not have borne the greatness thereof. Therefore He came to us as man,—He who is the perfect Bread of the Father, giving Himself, like milk to children, so that being nourished, as it were, at the breasts of His flesh, and thus accustomed to *eat and drink the Word of God*, we might possess in ourselves Him who is bread of immortality, the Spirit of the Father.<sup>1</sup>

The words of St. Irenæus, then, are by no means conclusive against the doctrine of transubstantiation, for they have not the faintest bearing on the question; nor do they militate against ‘the view that the Word is offered in the Eucharist.’ On the contrary, the whole tenor of his argument confirms it, for the faithful partake of that which is offered, and that which they eat and drink is the vivifying Word of God, who came to them as Man and nourishes them with His Flesh.

Perhaps the passage that brings out most clearly the vivid realism of St. Irenæus is the following:—

If the flesh be not saved, then neither has He redeemed us with His Blood, nor is the chalice of the Eucharist the Communion of His Blood, or the bread we break the Communion of His Body. . . . And since we are His members and are nourished by the creation, . . . the chalice, which is His creature, He confessed to be His Blood, wherewith He imbues our

<sup>1</sup> IV. 38. 1. In these words St. Irenæus probably has in mind the symbolism of his time, which represented the Holy Eucharist under the form of milk, the mystic nourishment, given by the Good Shepherd to His flock. In the crypt of Cornelius, in the cemetery of St. Callixtus, there is a picture of the Good Shepherd, standing between two sheep and holding a small vessel full of milk. In the crypt of Lucina, in the same cemetery, the vessel containing the symbolical food is placed on the altar between two sheep, thus showing that the mystic milk is symbolic of the Good Shepherd Himself, who is offered on the altar. In the Acts of St. Perpetua, written by herself just before her martyrdom, A.D. 203, she refers to the Holy Eucharist under the symbol of milk. ‘I saw a garden of immense space and in the middle of it a tall man, sitting down, dressed like a shepherd, having white hair. He was milking His sheep, surrounded by many thousands of persons clad in white. He called me by my name, bade me welcome, and gave me some curds of the milk He had drawn. *I put my hands together, took and eat them, and all that were present said aloud, Amen.*’ St. Clement of Alexandria says: ‘The Church nourishes her children with milk . . . and the milk is the Body of Christ.’

blood, and the bread, which is of creation, He assured to be His Body whereby He supports our bodies. Since, then, the mixed chalice and the made bread receive the Word of God and the Eucharist becomes the Body and Blood of Christ, whereby the substance of our flesh is supported and sustained; how can they say that the flesh that is nourished with the Body and Blood of Christ, and is His member, cannot receive the gift of God, which is life eternal. As the Blessed Paul says in his epistle to the Ephesians, 'we are members of his body, from His flesh and from His bones.' He says this, not of some spiritual and invisible man, 'for a spirit hath neither flesh nor bones,' but of the truly human system, which consists of flesh and nerves and bones; which is nourished from the chalice, which is His Blood, and is fed with the bread, which is His Body. And as the wood of the vine, laid in the earth, bears fruit in due season and the grain of wheat, falling into the earth and being dissolved in it, rises manifold by the Spirit of God who upholdeth all things, and as these thereupon through the wisdom of God come into the use of man, and, receiving the Word of God, become the Eucharist, which is the Body of Christ; so our bodies, nourished by It, and put into the ground and dissolved in it, shall rise in due season, when the Word of God grants them resurrection unto the glory of God and the Father.<sup>1</sup>

It may be here pointed out that in his insistence, in this and other passages, on the fact that the bread and wine are of the same creation as ourselves, St. Ireneus has in mind the Gnostic teaching that Christ is Son to a Being superior to the Creator of the world. According to this view, he says in another place,<sup>2</sup> Our Lord would have been unjust had He taken bread, which His Father, not being the Creator, had therefore not made, and declared it to be His Body, and affirmed the mixed chalice to be His Blood; just as it would have been wrong for Him to have taken men from Him who made them and called them to His Kingdom. This is the only reason why the Bishop of Lyons insists on this fact; and his words cannot be taken, *pace* Dr. Hitchcock, as an indication, that 'whereas we regard the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as an extension of the grace of the Incarnation, in his anti-Gnostic eyes it was an extension of His creative energy.'<sup>3</sup> St. Ireneus regarded the Eucharist, just as we do, as an extension of the grace of the Incarnation; for, as we have seen in several passages, the principal object of the Eucharist, as of the Incarnation, was to confer incorruptibility and immortality in the resurrection to come.

It now remains to give briefly the teaching of St. Ireneus on the proper dispositions of those who offer the sacrifice and partake of the bread of immortality in this 'incorruptible banquet.' As in the Old, so in the New Testament,

<sup>1</sup> V. 2. 1 and 2.<sup>2</sup> IV. 33. 2.

Loc. cit. p. 278.



God accepts sacrifice, not because He has need of it, but because man thereby shows Him honour and love. He accepted the oblation of Abel, which was offered in holiness and simplicity, but turned away from Cain's sacrifice, because it was offered with jealousy and malice in his heart against his brother. God is not deceived by an oblation that, in outward appearance only, is purely, rightly and legitimately offered, but which in reality is offered by one who is secretly in sin and has not the fear of God in his heart. Such a sacrifice profits him nothing, unless he cease from sin. In fact, it makes him another Cain, for, like the first murderer, he slays the Just One. Sacrifice, then, does not of itself sanctify the man, but purity of conscience in him who offers sanctifies the sacrifice<sup>1</sup> and moves God to accept it as from a friend.<sup>2</sup> 'With pure mind and faith unfeigned, with firm hope and fervent love'—with these dispositions ought we to join in the pure oblation which the Church alone offers to God. They who partake of the supper of God, 'the incorruptible banquet,' which is given at the marriage feast of His Son, must have on the wedding garment, that is, must be adorned with works of holiness, in order that the Spirit of God may rest upon them. If through their evil conversation they have not received the Spirit of God, they will be cast into exterior darkness. 'Qui enim est bonus et justus et mundus et immaculatus, neque malum aliquid, neque injustum, neque abominandum in suo sponsali talamo sustinebit.'<sup>3</sup>

According to St. Irenæus, then, the essence of the Eucharistic sacrifice consists, not in the *fractio panis*, but in the prayer of consecration. The 'word of God,' the 'evocation of God' (ἐκκλησις τοῦ Θεοῦ), the 'word of invocation' (λόγος τῆς ἐπικλήσεως),—these expressions are used to point out the efficient cause of which the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is the effect. It is by the power of this word that the bread and wine *become* the Body and Blood of Christ. He professes the same realism as his master, St. Justin—the Bread is the Body of Christ, the tempered wine is His Blood. He makes no advance on

<sup>1</sup> As a specimen of Dr. Hitchcock's biassed reasoning, it may be mentioned that he quotes this sentence as unfavourable to the Catholic teaching that it is Christ Himself who is offered in the Christian sacrifice! 'Would he have said this if the oblation were the Son of God Himself? Would He need any sanctifying prayer or conscience of men?'—Loc. cit. p. 274, n.

<sup>2</sup> IV. 18. 3.

<sup>3</sup> IV. 36. 6.

the plain and simple words of Our Lord. The theology of St. Ireneus on the Holy Eucharist is little more than a re-statement of the primitive data of Scripture and Tradition. Pre-eminently a man of tradition, he abides by the teaching of the Elders and eschews all speculation on the mysteries of the faith. St. Ireneus came too early to answer the question, *how* does the Bread become the Body of Christ? Had he been asked, he would doubtless have answered, as did St. Cyril of Jerusalem, that the bread is 'changed' (μεταβέβληται) into the Body of Christ.<sup>1</sup> The idea of a change in the elements must have been present to his mind when he wrote<sup>2</sup>:—

Although the Lord might have given food and wine to the assembled guests, creating them out of nothing, He did not do so; but *taking the bread, which is from the earth, and giving thanks, and likewise making water into wine*, He gave food to those who were reclining and drink to those who were invited to the marriage feast; showing that God who made the earth and bade it bear fruit, . . . in these latter times through His Son giveth to the human race the blessing of food and the grace of drink (*benedictionem escæ et gratiam potus*).

It must also be remembered that the traditional realism had so deeply entered into the minds of the faithful, that the Gnostics even exploited it to gain more disciples. St. Ireneus tells us that Marcion, while consecrating mixed cups of wine and water, protracted the prayer of invocation (the Epiclesis) to a great length, so as to be able—by what means he does not say—to make the wine appear a deep purple, to signify that the Power he had invoked had shed His Blood into the chalice.<sup>3</sup> This points to a firm belief not only in the Real Presence but also in a real change in the elements.

The only *virtus sacramenti* of which St. Ireneus speaks is the power of the Eucharist to impart incorruptibility to our bodies, which makes them to rise at the time appointed by God. The Gnostics taught that there was an eternal antagonism between flesh and spirit, that the flesh was essentially evil, doomed for ever to the corruption of the grave. How can this be, he asks, when our flesh is nourished with the pure flesh of Christ? That which we eat and drink in the Eucharist is not only an earthly human body like our own, but the Word of God, who came to us as man and nourishes us with His flesh, which is the 'bread

<sup>1</sup> *Cat. Myst.*, v. 7.

<sup>2</sup> III. 11. 5.

<sup>3</sup> I. 13. 1.



of immortality.' For Christ is the 'vivifying Word,'<sup>1</sup> the 'Spirit that giveth life to man,'<sup>2</sup> and therefore our bodies, nourished with His flesh, shall rise again incorruptible in the life to come.

This was the faith that the disciple of St. Justin had received from the Elders who had conversed with the Apostles; this was the faith taught in Asia Minor, Rome and Gaul. It is little more than a restatement of the words of Christ, couched in such terms as would best meet the negations of the Gnostics. The time would soon come when Christian thinkers, and heretics too, would ask questions about this 'mystery of the children of glory,' and various answers would be given. Every generation will assist, by its questions and answers, in the progress and development of the doctrine of the Eucharist. But underlying every fresh advance of our knowledge of this sacred mystery, the simple faith of the Church has ever been the same, from our days to the days of St. Irenæus, that in the Eucharist we have the real Body and Blood of the Word-made-Man; who is not only given to us as a grace-giving food and drink, but is offered again to God as the 'recapitulation' of His Passion, a propitiatory sacrifice for the remission of sin.

EDWARD R. JAMES.

<sup>1</sup> V. 8. 3.

<sup>2</sup> V. 9. 1. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45, 'a quickening Spirit.'

# NOTES AND QUERIES

## THEOLOGY

### A CONFESSOR'S POWER OF DISPENSATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Preparations have been made for a marriage ceremony. The parties are actually in the church, and a refusal to assist would entail serious consequences. At the last moment the confessor discovers that there is an impediment of consanguinity in the third degree, absolutely unknown to anyone except the two concerned—the prospective bridegroom has only recently come to the place, and he and his future bride are to leave in a few days. The Ordinary, I presume, could give a dispensation: but the Ordinary cannot be consulted: the affair, if arranged, has to be arranged in half an hour. The confessor dispenses.

Something to be said for it, I admit. But, at the same time, I think, very irregular. Relationship is necessarily a public impediment. And even the new law gives the confessor faculties only when there is question of an occult case.

I shall be glad to know your view.

X.

As every student of the Code remembers, Canon 1045, after guaranteeing Ordinaries power over nearly all ecclesiastical impediments 'when all preparations have been made for the wedding, and when the marriage cannot, without probable danger of grave evil, be postponed till a dispensation is secured from the Holy See,' adds (§ 3) that 'in the same circumstances, the same power is held by all those mentioned in Canon 1044 [the parish priest, the assistant priest, and confessor], but only for occult cases in which even the local Ordinary cannot be approached at all, or only under danger of violating a secret.'

In the case given the general conditions are fulfilled. Arrangements have been made for the marriage, and there is danger in postponement. The only trouble is to determine whether we are dealing with one of the 'occult' cases to which the provision made in the third paragraph is restricted.

To make the problem definite, we may summarize the cases that can possibly occur. The Code has not abolished the time-honoured distinction between impediments public or occult 'by their very nature' and others public or occult merely *de facto* and more or less accidentally. Owing to the abolition of illicit affinity, nearly all the diriment impediments are now 'of their nature' public—though an exception must still



be made of most cases of 'crime,' and of blood-relationship resulting from the carnal lapse of one or other of the parents. Assuming all that, the cases that may arise are those of, 1°, impediments naturally and *de facto* public; 2°, impediments naturally occult but *de facto* public; 3°, impediments naturally public but *de facto* occult; and, 4°, impediments both naturally and *de facto* occult. Now, noting carefully the fact that the third paragraph of Canon 1045 speaks of occult *cases*, not of occult *impediments*, we can have no hesitation in saying that the confessor's powers certainly extend to the fourth case, and that, with equal certainty, they do *not* extend to the first and second. He can deal, for example, with an impediment of crime known only to a very few; but he cannot deal with that same impediment, nor *a fortiori* with an impediment (say) of consanguinity, known to several trustworthy members of the community. The whole difficulty centres round the third case—and, unfortunately, it is the very case that 'X' proposes. Presupposing other conditions fulfilled, *can* the confessor give a dispensation in a case (say) of legitimate relationship that, through a combination of unusual circumstances, happens to be practically unknown to the community?

In that connexion we cannot do better than give a résumé of a little controversy that has been going the round of the Continental magazines. It serves to indicate the difficulties felt by experts on this very matter, and gives us at the same time the arguments on which we must rely in coming to a practical conclusion.

It began with a contribution by 'Socius' to the *Monitore Ecclesiastico* of last February.<sup>1</sup> He cited a dozen or more of the recent commentators, and found them on the whole unsatisfactory. Some merely copied or translated the words of the Canon: some committed themselves so far as to underline the words 'occult' or 'occult cases':<sup>2</sup> others were inclined to restrict the faculty to impediments naturally occult<sup>3</sup>: a few supported this last view indirectly, by drawing attention to the characteristics of an occult impediment<sup>4</sup>: while others still, in more or less halting fashion, declared for an extension of powers to cases like that outlined by our correspondent.<sup>5</sup> The canon has 'interred the *casus perplexus* with all funeral honours,' but, in view of this difference of opinion among experts, what is to be thought of the canon itself? 'Socius,' with all due deference to the men who think otherwise, declares in favour of the confessor's power to dispense in impediments naturally public but actually occult—the case submitted by 'X.' And his reasons, so far as we can epitomise them, are:—

1°. The third section of the canon speaks of the 'same power' as is mentioned in the first. And the first section, beyond all doubt, covers public and occult impediments—as does Canon 1043 to which it refers.

<sup>1</sup> pp. 59-62.

<sup>2</sup> e.g., Bevilacqua, Raia, Ferrazza, Arregui, Sebastiani, Gury-Tummolo, Tanqueray, Pighi, Génicot.

<sup>3</sup> e.g., Zetta, Cerato.

<sup>4</sup> e.g., Creusen-Vermeersch, Ferreres.

<sup>5</sup> e.g., Noldin, Chelodi.

2°. There is every reason, therefore, for emphasizing the fact that the third section speaks, not of occult *impediments*, but of occult *cases*.

3°. The same third section indicates, as one of the circumstances that lead to a grant of the faculty, the possible violation of a secret. The secret binds everyone (parish-priest, assistant priest and confessor) in relation to everyone—the Ordinary included. And the obligation of observing it may urge even in the case of a naturally public impediment that remains actually occult. Therefore, even in this case, the Ordinary is not be to approached and the confessor is thrown on his own resources.

But this, he admits, leads to very serious practical difficulties. Suppose the impediment becomes actually public afterwards, what is to be done? A dispensation given in the sacramental tribunal is, as a rule, of no avail in the external forum (1047). What if one of the parties repudiates the marriage? The impediment can be proved, the dispensation cannot, and the way is open to grave abuse and gross injustice. One remedy, of course, is to induce the penitent to disclose the matter to the parish priest: *he* can give a dispensation and have it recorded in the secret Curial archives: that will save the secret, and safeguard the dispensation in the external forum in all contingencies (1047). But how if the penitent cannot be induced to do even that? 'Socius' finds himself driven, by a verbal interpretation of the canon, to hold that, even in that case, even when the parties are *mala fide*, the confessor is bound to give the dispensation: and he sees no way out of the *impasse* till the lines of escape are indicated by a special decree of the Commission for interpreting the Code.

In a long contribution, immediately following 'Socius' reply,<sup>1</sup> the editor of the *Monitore* declares himself stongly on the opposite side. 'Socius' interpretation, he says, would leave a very wide opening for frauds of all kinds against the law: it would accentuate the undesirable discrepancy that sometimes arises between the divine and the ecclesiastical forum, and increase enormously the number of cases in which the Ordinary would have to condemn (1990) marriages valid in the sight of God; and, since it often involves a second dispensation (1047), it reflects very seriously on the arrangements made for the internal forum. The canon speaks of 'cases,' not of 'impediments': true, but that matters little: the whole context suggests the limitation. In danger of death, the parish priest has full power over public and occult impediments; can he, therefore, select whatever forum he pleases? No, the editor contends; if he gave a sacramental dispensation in case of public impediments, his action would be invalid. And the same must be said of the confessor: the dispensation must correspond to the impediment, and a sacramental dispensation is, therefore, absolutely useless—in fact, a contradiction in terms—unless the impediment falls essentially into the internal forum category by being both naturally and actually occult. If this rule be followed, the difficulties mentioned by 'Socius' disappear: there is no room for fraud; Canons 1046 and 1047 guarantee the necessary proof in

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. pp. 62-68.



case of recalcitrance ; the secret is preserved in regard to everyone except the Ordinary, and that suffices ; the regulations made for each forum are adequate and need no supplementing : and, if it be objected that this interpretation reduces the confessor's power almost to vanishing point, the answer is 'yes, in so far as the diriment impediments are concerned ; but the impedient impediments still leave a wide field open.' The confessor's duty is plain : when an impediment naturally public (though actually occult) is revealed, he is to tell the penitent that he cannot give a dispensation unless the whole transaction is recorded in the secret archives of the Bishop or of the Penitentiary. A hard law ? Yes : 'dura lex, sed lex' ; and there is no need to apply to the Commission.

Passing over other comments, we find the matter discussed at great length in the last May issue of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* by M. Arendt, Penitentiary theologian and consultor to the Holy Office.<sup>1</sup> He quite agrees that there is no need to appeal to the Commission ; but his reason is that 'Socius' view is amply borne out by the words of the law, and that, if practical difficulties arise, we can find the solution in the generally accepted rules of Moral Theology. The supposed impossibility of giving in the internal forum a dispensation from an impediment naturally public is quite without foundation : the law itself recognizes the procedure (1047) : whether the dispensation is given in the external or in the internal forum, the *essential* effect—capacity for marriage—is exactly the same, and the only difference is that further steps are necessary to have this effect *recognized* by the external society to which the penitent belongs. To assert that the second dispensation supplies an essential defect in the first is to be guilty of a worse 'contradiction in terms' than 'Socius' could be possibly accused of. In Canon 1044 the confessor is certainly empowered to grant in the internal forum all the dispensations that the parish-priest can grant in the external—for 'when the law makes no distinction, neither should we.' And, if further evidence be needed of the essential equality between the two classes of dispensations, it will be found in the regulations governing a kindred matter—absolution granted in the internal forum from censures incurred in the external (2251).

Once that is granted, the only question that really arises is whether the conditions enumerated in the third paragraph are fulfilled or not—whether, that is, there is serious danger involved in delay and whether the Ordinary can be conveniently approached. As for the dangers, the ordinary rules hold—the claims of charity and justice, the welfare of the parties themselves and of others, the needs of the Church etc., are to be taken into account. And, on the second count, the necessity of taking steps to prevent a subsequent repudiation of the marriage must not be lost sight of. If the (naturally public) impediment is in no way defamatory, and there is no special reason for keeping it secret, the penitent must be told that he is morally obliged to make it a matter of the external forum and have the dispensation registered. If it is defamatory, or there is special reason for secrecy, the confessor will arrange (with the penitent's consent) to inform

<sup>1</sup> pp. 261-274.

the Penitentiary, and follow its instructions (1047). If the penitent refuses to follow such a reasonable suggestion—one that guarantees secrecy and at the same time provides for the validity of the marriage in the external forum, should the impediment ever become actually public—he must be informed that a dispensation will not be given : for, after all, the confessor, though empowered to act, is not obliged to use his faculties in favour of a man who violates obvious moral obligations and is clearly indisposed for sacramental absolution. With these precautions the law will be saved from abuse—except such abuse as every human law entails.

Our readers, we are inclined to say, will support M. Arendt. His theory seems to make full allowance for all principles of law, and to combine in a golden mean the advantages claimed by both his predecessors in the controversy. And so, we think, 'X.'s' confessor can grant the dispensation—under the conditions specified.

#### SPECIAL REPLY OF THE CONGREGATION

As a supplement to the case just given, and as a useful comment on Canon 1045, we have great pleasure in quoting a reply which His Eminence Cardinal Logue received last year from the Congregation of the Sacraments, and which he has kindly given us permission to publish. In the Canon it is apparently stated that the Ordinary—or, in occult cases, when the Ordinary cannot be easily approached, the parish priest, assistant priest, or confessor—can grant a dispensation only when *two* conditions are fulfilled : 1°, when all preparations have been made for the marriage ; and, 2°, when the postponement involved in an application to Rome would entail likely danger of grave misfortune. Now it may easily happen that, in a special case, the second condition is so fully verified that it involves more serious trouble than, in the more normal run of things, would be involved in both together. For instance, illicit intercourse, between two persons bound by an impediment, has taken place with normal results. There are no preparations made for the marriage, no date fixed, no friends invited, no expenses incurred. The man—home, say, on holidays—is willing to contract marriage just now ; but, if the present opportunity is not availed of, he is more than likely to change his mind and marry someone else. Is it not true that in such circumstances the impending misfortune is much greater than it would be in the case of two individuals present in church, liable to some suspicion if the marriage is postponed, but determined at all costs to marry each other some time ? Ought not the one condition to be taken, therefore, as equivalent to both ? And, on a common-sense interpretation of the canon—and with a back glance at Canon 81, which empowers the Ordinary to grant the usual dispensation from general laws when 'recourse to the Holy See is difficult and there is danger in delay'—ought we not claim that the Ordinary has faculties enough to meet the situation ?

On this the commentators have been brief and unsatisfactory. They content themselves with transcribing or translating the clause, or perhaps venturing a timid suggestion that the first condition would be verified



even though the guests had not actually assembled for the marriage ceremony. The document sent to His Eminence carries us further. He had given a dispensation in a case of the kind described above, and, with a view to securing a satisfactory pronouncement, informed the Congregation. The reply, dated 12th September, 1919, was as follows:—

Super a se concessa dispensatione Ordinarius acquiescat, et deinceps quoties matrimonium nequeat differri absque gravis mali periculo Ordinarius dispensando utatur iure suo.

The first clause—'Ordinarius acquiescat'—could be taken as involving nothing more than a grant of a *sanatio in radice*; and, if so, would throw little light on the situation. Even the general commission to dispense might be taken by the hyper-critical as a personal concession to His Eminence himself. But the two final words settle the question. When the Ordinary does dispense, he merely exercises his 'own right'—the right guaranteed to him by law. Which means in practice that, when the second condition is fulfilled, the first need give little or no trouble.

A very important reply.

### BANNS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I am grateful for your reply to my difficulties about 'Banns,' July number I. E. RECORD, pp. 50-51, and I feel pleased with your substantial agreement with me on most points of that important and practical matter.

I am, however, disappointed with myself in not having been able to make my meaning clear to you. When I spoke of 'the freedom even of six months only which he gets,' last paragraph, p. 51, what I meant to convey was: the certificate of freedom which the man brings to the priest who is to marry him, and which he has got from the last parish priest in whose parish he lived (and who is bound to give such certificate to all those who have lived in his parish for six months), without troubling myself whether said parish priest made further enquiries, about the man's freedom, from other parish priests—of places where he might have lived previously.

That is what seems to me very troublesome, if not impracticable, at such an urgent period as the last days of Shrove. I am sure you will admit that we must strive to do our best for parties in such pressing and frequent emergencies.

And though you seem to hold—I am sorry to think—that such 'rushing' of ceremony is quite out of harmony with the requirements of the Code, still let me ask you to consider this: If a man presents to me his certificate of freedom, am I not to conclude that there is, then, good grounds to think 'there is no impediment in his case,' that the document, on the face of it, says he is 'free to contract,' and, as a matter of course, has confessed, and is instructed, etc.

If not all this, it is not easy to see how his having procured certificates from two or three other parish priests with whom he lived can give much further assurance on these points. Whilst on my side I am convinced that the girl, whose banns I have arranged, is thoroughly equipped for *immediate* matrimonial procedure.

I fear, too, that the course you prescribe would be very severe and

embarrassing to the parties if their marriage was put back into Lent, and that they would look on the celebrant as a very cranky individual, at least, in requiring a line of action they never heard of before, and which would single their case out as exceptional and open to suspicion. Our Irish people, I need not say, have a great dislike to marry in Lent: they look upon that time as unlucky: they feel very creepy and nervous about it; and that feeling, though it may be considered unreasonable, would very likely interfere afterwards with conception, etc.—a result that we should guard against.

Another point I would direct your consideration to is your non-acceptance of my remark when I say there is 'a very strong presumption (not proof) of a man's being single and free, if no girl has come claiming him for six months.' You object, 'There may be obstacles.' But what can prevent her from writing to the parish priest and stating her claim? You add, 'Even girls have a little patience.' Yes, when there is question of sponsalia, but not equally so when actually married to the man. They then are anxious, I should think, to enter into their own—*jus in re*.

But be that as it may, the really troublesome and important point with me in the whole matter is the need of enquiring from perhaps several parish priests about the freedom of the parties, or else the reporting to the Ordinary, which latter may take much time, even by post, and which would seem overwhelming to a Bishop when recurring from all parts of his diocese. Can there be found no escape from this unpleasant *impasse* which would satisfy the requirements of the Code?

It occurs to me that the following may meet the difficulty:—

Bishops usually appoint Vicars Forane in various parts of their dioceses, with faculties to dispense in Banns, to whom the people can have speedy and easy access. May we not naturally expect that these Vicars receive, or can receive, all faculties necessary for the proper discharge of their commission, amongst which is, or may be, included the power to make enquiries, about the freedom of contracting parties, from Vicars-General or parish priests, as the Ordinary himself does, if needed—or otherwise, in their discretion, to declare them unnecessary. Then, when Vicars dispense in Banns, they can also make enquiries about freedom, and thus matters would be made smooth and convenient for both priests and people.

Should you think this method feasible and legitimate, I would be glad you would express your approval of it. If not, kindly lay down for us a more correct and authentic alternative. I am sorry to have to trouble you again on this question, but its practical importance (and probable frequency) must be my apology even to you who are so courteous and accessible to all cantankerous contributors, '*quorum magna pars fui*.'

A SUBSCRIBER.

The courtesy of this note disarms criticism. And really there is very little to criticise: the suggestions are very reasonable.

On 'the freedom of six months' we had some doubt. But 'Subscriber' has made matters fairly clear. We presume that the letters he speaks of are the same as are contemplated in the Maynooth Statutes<sup>1</sup>: 'in this country parish priests usually give testimonial letters of 'freedom'

<sup>1</sup> N. 160, p. 79.



to men who are going to marry, in these or similar terms, "The bearer, *N.N.*, is free to contract marriage with any woman equally free." That implies a great amount of 'freedom': though, of course, in regard to consanguinity, affinity, and a host of other impediments, it leaves the parish priest of place of marriage in very considerable doubt. But it certainly implies that the writer has made all the necessary enquiries, and that, so far as impediments like *ligamen* are concerned, the priest who assists at the marriage may proceed without further trouble.

And, to guard against undue scrupulosity, we need only remind 'Subscriber' of a Roman reply quoted more than once. If the man—or woman—has lived in far-off places; if he, or she, knows little of the local clergy, or the local clergy little of him or her; then leave the matter to the Bishop, and depend ultimately on more easily available evidence—including (if necessary) the sworn testimony of the man or woman concerned.

As for 'Subscriber's' difficulties:—

1°. The Shrovetide problem solves itself. The girl is free—so the parish priest testifies. The man is free—so the extern parish priest assures us. Apart from the more obvious impediments—which will claim the attention of any man half awake—the road to a valid and lawful marriage is plain and open.

2°. 'If a man presents his certificate of freedom,' yes, all is well—provided it be of the kind already mentioned. The 'certificates of two or three other parish priests with whom he lived'—very useful, and indeed necessary, if the certificate is *not* of the kind mentioned, and if the 'living' extended over six months and followed the age of puberty.

3°. Trouble about Lenten marriages, no doubt. But would it not be well to let our people know the statutes of the Church?

4°. 'Subscriber' knows much more about practical life than we do. But, in our small experience of missionary life, we have met, or heard of, cases in which the woman made no claims against the man—because they had separated voluntarily, or because the man had absconded and left no clue to his address. Has 'Subscriber' not met similar cases?

5°. So far as we can see, there is no trouble whatever in regard to 'Subscriber's' suggestion about Vicars Forane. They are delegated to give dispensations: *a fortiori* they are delegated to arrange all the preliminaries: 'Cui licet id quod est plus, ei licet utique id quod est minus.'

M. J. O'DONNELL.

## CANON LAW

## CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS OF A PARISH PRIEST

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. Would you kindly discuss in the I. E. RECORD in how far a parish priest is bound to perform personally the duties attached to his office. Of course I am specially interested in the case in which a parish priest has a curate or curates. Is he then free to transfer his obligations to the latter, or must he still perform some of them himself?

II. May a parish priest, who through old age or ill health finds it very inconvenient to say the Mass *pro populo* in the parochial church on Sundays and holidays, celebrate it in his own oratory?

III. Is a parish priest bound to binate to secure that a notable part of his people are not deprived of an opportunity of hearing Mass?

SACERDOS.

I. It may be stated as a general principle that a parish priest is bound to perform personally the duties attached to his office. The Code, indeed, does not expressly state this; the fact, however, that it contemplates a substitute or an assistant for the parish priest only in exceptional cases clearly implies it. The conformity of this conclusion with the pre-Code teaching affords a further confirmation of it. The views on this question were to be found principally in connexion with the obligation of residence. Theologians and canonists maintained that residence which was merely material did not suffice: they required that it should be also laborious; in other words, that a parish priest should himself discharge a substantial part of the pastoral duties. Here are the words of St. Alphonsus: 'Hence doctors commonly say . . . that a parish priest is not regarded as residing if he does not himself discharge the principal duties, namely, the administration of the word of God, of the sacraments, etc.'<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that a personal discharge of his obligations is necessary when a parish priest is in residence and a substitute or assistant has not been appointed. There are other circumstances, however, in which the general principle must be modified more or less: we shall discuss those which are of most frequent occurrence.

(a) When a parish priest is legitimately absent from his parish he cannot be bound to a personal discharge of his duties: legitimate absence and personal obligation are incompatible. In these circumstances he is obliged merely to provide for the spiritual welfare of his flock by means of a substitute. This obligation arises even though the absence is but for a short period<sup>2</sup>; and if it lasts for more than a week, the appointment

<sup>1</sup> *Th. Mor.*, lib. iv, n. 127. Cf. Ferraris, *Bibliotheca*, verbum *Parochus*, art. 2, n. 18; Bouix, *De Parocho*, p. 559.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 465, § 6: 'Etiam pro tempore brevioris absentiae parochus debet fidelium necessitatibus providere, maxime si id peculiariora rerum adjuncta postulent.' Cf. Maynooth Statutes, 1900, n. 280.



of the substitute must receive the approval of the Ordinary.<sup>1</sup> There is one duty, however, viz., the application of the Mass *pro populo*, which may be performed either by the parish priest himself or by his substitute.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand it is quite clear that unlawful absence does not constitute an excusing cause. The Ordinary, however, should secure, as far as possible, that the spiritual welfare of the faithful is not adversely affected by the failure of the pastor to observe the law of residence<sup>3</sup>; but even after precautions of this nature have been taken, the parish priest still remains bound to return to his parish and fulfil personally the obligations attached to his office.

(b) The general principle must also be modified when it becomes impossible or very difficult for the parish priest to discharge personally all his duties on account of the great number of his parishioners or for some similar reason. In circumstances of this nature it is provided that curates (*vicarii cooperatores*) should be appointed.<sup>4</sup> The name *vicarii cooperatores* and the whole tenor of the legislation on this question imply that the parish priest is still bound to perform personally a part of his pastoral obligations, and that the curates are intended to assist him, not to take his place altogether.<sup>5</sup> Neither the Code nor, as far as we are aware, particular legislation defines with anything like mathematical accuracy the precise functions which each is to perform; they confine themselves to general principles. Commentators are a little more explicit. The following paragraph from Ferraris represents pretty fairly the general teaching on the question:

A parish priest, to make better provision for the care of souls, to secure the fulfilment of parochial duties, and to obtain some peace and rest for himself, can have one or several curates, and can leave to him or them the more difficult duties, such as to go by night to the sick, to perform the divine office in filial churches situated at a distance, to hear many confessions, and the like; provided at the same time the parish priest himself, when there is no just impediment, does not cease to perform personally some of the pastoral duties, especially the principal ones; and, when he is asked by the parishioners, he does not refuse to go to them, especially the sick amongst them.<sup>6</sup>

It must be remembered that, so far as the care of souls in the parish is concerned, a curate is subject to his parish priest; and, hence, if any question arises as to who is to perform some particular duty, the parish priest's view must prevail for the time being, but the curate, if he thinks he has a grievance, may appeal to the Bishop.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Canon 465, § 4.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 466, § 5.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 2168, § 1.

<sup>4</sup> Canon 476, § 7.

<sup>4</sup> Canon 476, § 1.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Canon 476, § 6.

<sup>6</sup> I.e.

<sup>7</sup> Canon 476, § 7: 'Subest parochus, qui eum paterne instruat ac dirigat in cura animarum, ei invigilet et saltem quotannis ad Ordinarium de eodem referat.' Cf. Maynooth Statutes, n. 351: 'Si quod exurgat dissidium inter Parochum et Vicarium, tota res iudicio Ordinarii committatur. Interim causa non finita, Vicarius sententiae Parochi cedit.'

(c) Canon Law further provides that, if a parish priest, on account of old age, mental weakness, ignorance, blindness, or some other permanent cause, becomes unfit to discharge his duties properly, he should be given an assistant.<sup>1</sup> In how far the appointment of an assistant excuses a parish priest from his personal fulfilment of the obligations attached to his office depends to a large extent on the nature of the cause on account of which the appointment was made. If it be such as to render the parish priest unfit to perform any duty whatever—the Code certainly contemplates the possibility of an assistant being appointed in such cases<sup>2</sup>—then it excuses him altogether, and the assistant takes his place in everything, and has all the rights of a parish priest and all his obligations too except that of applying the Mass *pro populo*.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, if the cause constitutes only a partial impediment, and the assistant is appointed merely to help the parish priest, then the relations between the two and the extent of their personal obligations must be determined from the letters of appointment.<sup>4</sup>

In this connexion it may be well to say a word upon a case that the Code does not deal with expressly. It sometimes happens that parish priests, through old age or some other permanent cause, gradually become incapable of discharging any parochial duty, and that, instead of any special assistants (*vicarii adjutores*) being appointed, the ordinary curates take their places altogether, and cease to be merely helpers. Well, normally we think that this condition of things is not in accordance with the spirit of the law. When ordinary curates (*vicarii cooperatores*) are appointed, it is presupposed that the parish priest will still perform part of the parochial functions, and watch over and direct them in the performance of the remainder. If this presupposition is no longer verified, normally further assistance and new arrangements will be required. If, however, in particular cases the ordinary curates are willing and able to discharge the extra duties, and if the spiritual welfare of the people is thus sufficiently provided for—this is the dominant consideration—we are of opinion that the requirements of Canon Law are sufficiently fulfilled: the curates become virtually *vicarii adjutores*.

In cases in which parish priests are permitted to discharge all or any of their duties through assistants or curates, it is always presumed that in this way sufficient provision is made for the spiritual welfare of the people. If such be not the case, some other remedy must be adopted, such, for example, as the removal of the parish priest or the division of the parish.<sup>5</sup>

II. Canon 466, § 4, states that 'A parish priest should celebrate the Mass which is to be applied for the people in the parochial church, unless circumstances require or render it advisable that it should be celebrated elsewhere.' In the case under consideration, therefore, we think the parish priest quite justified in celebrating the Mass *pro populo* in his own oratory. It is evident that a parish priest, such as is contemplated in this

<sup>1</sup> Canon 475, § 1.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 475, § 3.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 475, § 2.

<sup>4</sup> Canon 475, § 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Canon 475, § 4, and Canon 476, § 8.



query, is unable to perform personally many of the duties which would ordinarily fall to his lot, and that consequently these must be provided for in one of the ways indicated in the reply to the previous question.

III. In order that a parish priest may binate at all he must have permission from the Holy See or his Ordinary in accordance with the regulations of Canon 806. Presuming, however, that this permission has been obtained, the further question then arises: 'Is he bound to binate in order that a notable part of his people may not be deprived of the opportunity of hearing Mass?'

There is nothing stated, at least expressly, in the Code on this point. We must, therefore, deduce an answer from the general principles of equity and from the teaching of canonists and theologians.<sup>1</sup> Arguing from the nature of the parochial office we have very little difficulty in coming to an affirmative conclusion. A parish priest by his office is bound to make due provision for the spiritual welfare of his flock, and consequently he should afford them an opportunity of fulfilling one of their most important spiritual duties, viz., the hearing of Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation. *Ex hypothesi* this cannot be done without a second Mass, there is nobody but the parish priest to celebrate it, and he has permission for this purpose. His obligation seems to us to be quite clear in the circumstances. It may happen, of course, that, through old age, ill health, or some other reason, he is unable to celebrate the second Mass, in which case provision should be made for it by the appointment of an assistant or in some of the other ways contemplated by Canon Law. We speak only of the circumstances in which he is capable of personally fulfilling the duty, and no other measures have been taken for its discharge.

This conclusion is confirmed by the teaching of canonists and theologians. Thus Benedict XIV declares that: 'In this state of things it is the agreed opinion of all that a parish priest not only can, but clearly should celebrate Mass twice on the same day, and, after he had finished Mass in one parish, should go to the other; lest the people of one or the other church be excluded from hearing Mass on a day of obligation.'<sup>2</sup> It is true, indeed, that usually, as in this quotation, there is express reference only to the case in which a parish priest has two parishes; but the reason for the imposition of the obligation is quite as strong when a second Mass is required in same church to afford a notable part of the faithful an opportunity of fulfilling their obligation in this matter. Benedict XIV, too, in his Letter *Declarasti*, holds that the two cases are in the same juridical position.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Canon 20.

<sup>2</sup> *De Synodo Dioc.*, lib. vi. c. vii. n. 2. Cf. Gasparri, *De S. Euch.*, vol. i. n. 387.

<sup>3</sup> § *Ea potissimum*.—Hi quippe duo casus eodem jure censendi sunt, uti praecepit advertit Theophilus Raynaudus, tom. 71 *Operum Editionis Lugdunensis*, p. 8.

## PRIESTS' LETTERS TO NEWSPAPERS

REV. DEAR SIR,—A word from you on a little matter would be very welcome to a few colleagues and myself. We are in doubt as to how far a priest is free to write to the newspapers on secular matters—without the express permission, or in opposition to the wishes, of his Bishop. Canon 1386, I know, looks very strict and severe: it forbids secular priests 'to write in, or to assume the managership of, newspapers, magazines, etc., without the consent of their Ordinaries.' But, first of all, I think you will admit that the 'consent' here mentioned does not necessarily imply *explicit* permission. And, secondly, will you not agree that there is something in the following suggestion? Everyone sees that between managing a newspaper and contributing an occasional letter there is a very wide gulf indeed. Can it be reasonably supposed that both would be governed by exactly the same regulation? The people who are concerned with the active production of a newspaper may be divided into at least three well-defined classes: 1°, managers and editors; 2°, leader-writers, habitual contributors, all, in fact, who follow this line professionally; 3°, occasional contributors—and among *them*, I should say, the writer of a letter stands on the very outside edge. Now my suggestion is this: The canon (1386) deals with the first two classes—with managers, editors, and all who, in common parlance, write 'for the papers'; it has no reference to the man who—to provoke inquiry or vent a grievance—writes now and then on matters that affect the community but have no theological bearing.

I am ashamed to say I know very little about technical Canon Law. Perhaps as a consequence of that, I must plead guilty to knowing nothing about any decisions that may have been given on the points I have mentioned. But I rely on you. *Are* there any decisions? And, whether there are or not, do you think my suggestions admissible?

J. M.

Our correspondent has formed too modest an estimate of his knowledge of Canon Law. He has certainly displayed a very good grasp of the principles of interpretation; and, though we cannot agree with his view of Canon 1386, yet a better case, we think, could scarcely be made for it.

Well, as far as we are aware, no decisions on this question have been given: the canon itself is our only authentic guide. As we have already stated, J. M.'s interpretation of it, though plausible, is not, in our opinion, admissible. For the sake of clearness we shall quote the pertinent words of the canon in their original form: '*Vetantur clerici saeculares sine consensu suorum Ordinariorum . . . libros quoque, qui de rebus profanis tractent, edere, et in diariis, foliis vel libellis periodicis scribere vel eadem moderari.*' Now, it seems evident that the words *scribere in diariis* cover the occasional quite as well as the habitual contributor; and it is an axiom of interpretation that 'When the law does not distinguish neither should we do so'—*Ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus*. Occasionally, indeed, even though the words of a law give a clear, definite meaning, they must be understood in a restricted sense, lest otherwise injustice or absurdity would be the result. But there is no



injustice or absurdity in requiring a priest to have his Ordinary's consent even for a single contribution to a newspaper ; in fact, judging from the kind of clerical letters which find their way into the Press, it is a useful enough regulation.

That the phrase *scribere in* includes even the occasional contributor is evident also from an analogy with the prohibition regarding the publication of books on profane subjects, which immediately precedes. All must admit the words *edere libros* cover the publication of even one book. If, then, it were intended that the phrase *scribere in diariis*, etc., should embrace merely habitual contributors, some further indication was clearly demanded.

It is scarcely necessary to point out that this, like other ecclesiastical laws, admits parvity of matter ; and that the publication of an occasional letter in the Press without the Ordinary's consent will be usually only a venial violation of it.

We agree with our correspondent that express consent on the part of the Ordinary is not required : the words of the law are *sine consensu*, not *sine consensu expresso*. Tacit consent, therefore, will suffice ; in other words, if the Ordinary is aware that a priest is about to write a letter to the Press, and if he could conveniently forbid him and does not do so, the consent indicated by his silence satisfies the requirements of the Canon. Tacit, however, must be distinguished from presumed consent. The latter is not a real consent at all, and is not sufficient ; it is merely a presumption that consent would be given if the necessity for it were known.

#### THE READING OF NEWSPAPERS BY CLERICAL STUDENTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—I should be very grateful if you could let me have your opinion, as soon as is convenient, on the following question : Does the prohibition of Pius X against the reading of papers by clerical students still remain in force ? (Cf. *Acta*, 1910, p. 668.)

The reasons for the negative view would seem to be :—

(a) By virtue of Can. 6, § 6, this prohibition ceased since it was a disciplinary law and is not implicitly or explicitly contained in the Code.

(b) A question was asked concerning the Modernist oath which is contained in the *Motu Proprio*, in which the prohibition is found, and no reference was made in the reply to the prohibition to show that it still remained in force.

(c) The reasons given for the prohibition have no reference to Modernism.

The arguments for the affirmative would seem to be :—

(a) In the *Acta*, 1920, pp. 43-47, we have an explanation of Can. 6, § 6, which states that it refers only to general laws and not to particular laws made for special circumstances of place or time. Nay, even, it goes on to say that the general laws and provisions against Modernism remain. Now, since the prohibition in question is contained in the *Motu Proprio*, which lays down the laws and provisions against Modernism, it would seem that the prohibition was only a special law called for by the particular needs of the times, and not a ' *lex generalis prorsus, perpetuo et ubique valitura*, ' and consequently not at all affected by Can. 6, § 6.

(b) The fact that there is no mention of the prohibition in the reply of the Holy Office (*Acta*, 1918, p. 136) only proves that the H.O. was not questioned about it.

M. C.

There can be now no doubt that, notwithstanding Canon 6, n. 6, disciplinary laws binding on the entire Church, which are of their nature temporary and transitory, still remain in force, even though they are neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in the Code. This has been stated, or at least clearly implied, three distinct times in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* :—

(a) The Holy Office, on the 22nd March, 1918, declared that the regulations regarding Vigilance Committees and the oath against Modernism still bind because they are, of their nature, temporary and transitory.<sup>1</sup>

(b) For a similar reason the Congregation for Religious, on the 15th July, 1919, stated that the Decree *Inter reliquas*, dealing with religious who are conscripted, was still obligatory.<sup>2</sup>

(c) Finally, in the preliminary discussion of a case decided by the Congregation of the Council on the 10th January, 1920, the general statement is made that : ' It is certain that prescriptions and laws of their nature temporary and transitory, or which have reference to circumstances of place and time, since they have not the nature of a general law, do not fall under the abrogation prescribed by Canon 6, n. 6.'<sup>3</sup>

The only question, then, which remains to be determined, is whether this prohibition of Pius X is of a temporary character. We are of opinion that it is, and that consequently it still remains in force. From the nature of the case, and from the reply of the Holy Office and the preliminary discussion of Council just referred to, it is clear that all the provisions made to counteract the dangers of Modernism are temporary and transitory. That the law against the reading of newspapers by clerical students is one of these provisions seems clearly to follow from the fact that it is contained in the *Sacrorum Antistitum*, the official title of which is *Motu proprio quo quaedam statuuntur leges ad modernismi periculum propulsandum*—the selfsame *Motu proprio* in which the regulations on the anti-modernistic oath are contained.<sup>4</sup> Nor is there any real force in the objection that the reason assigned for the prohibition is to prevent waste of time. This, indeed, is the proximate reason ; but the

<sup>1</sup> *A. A. Sedis*, 1918, p. 136 : ' Praescriptiones praedictas, ob serpentes in praesenti modernisticos errores latas, natura quidem sua, temporarias esse ac transitorias, ideoque in Codicem Juris Canonici referri non potuisse ; aliunde tamen, cum virus Modernismi diffundi minime cessaverit, eas in pleno suo robore manere debere usquedum hac super re Apostolica Sedes aliter statuerit.'

<sup>2</sup> *A. A. Sedis*, 1919, pp. 321, 322 : ' Haec autem S. Congregatio, attenta negotii gravitate, animadvertendum censet in Codice Juris Canonici nullam haberi potuisse rationem praefati Decreti *Inter reliquas*, nec ejusdem praescripta Canonibus inserta fuisse, cum idem Decretum, natura sua, ad circumstantias temporum et locorum habeat relationem, nec generalis legis ecclesiasticae rationem induere possit.'

<sup>3</sup> *A. A. Sedis*, 1920, p. 45.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 1910, p. 655.



ultimate purpose, as is evident from the context, is to secure that clerical students are properly grounded in the sacred sciences and so rendered more capable of combating modernistic errors. Our correspondent has himself sufficiently answered the objection which might be drawn from the reply of the Holy Office.

J. KINANE.

## LITURGY

### FACULTIES FOR ERECTING STATIONS OF THE CROSS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly reply to the following queries in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD.

(1) I received faculties for erecting Stations of the Cross and erected them. After some days I got new pictures and new crosses of a better quality than the original ones. I should like to know if I need new faculties for validly erecting the latter. The doubt is rejected by some on the ground that the faculties were given, not for the particular act, but for the place, and should therefore be held to continue validly.

(2) Is there any rubric prescribing that the crosses should be fixed to the pictures? May they hang from the wall separately, e.g., beneath the pictures?

SACERDOS.

To erect the Stations of the Cross validly a priest must have procured a special faculty for that purpose, either directly from the Holy See or through the Father-General of the Friars Minor Observant, or from his Bishop. In addition to this, the consent of the Ordinary <sup>1</sup> *in writing* is to be obtained, and also the consent of the parish priest or superior of the church in which the Stations are to be erected. These conditions are prescribed under pain of nullity, as is clear from several decrees<sup>2</sup> of the Congregation of Indulgences. In the New Code (Canon 349, § 1, 1°) the power is granted to Bishops of erecting the Stations of the Cross in all the churches and chapels of their respective dioceses, and of deputing their priests to do the same. When the faculty of erecting the Stations in a particular church has been petitioned for and granted, it must, in our opinion, be rigidly interpreted as availing for the blessing and erecting of one set of Stations. Once the act is completed the faculty ceases, and any complete renewal of the Stations—or even of the greater part of them—no matter how short the interval, will necessitate a renewal of the faculty. The following reply<sup>3</sup> from the Congregation of Indulgences is sufficiently definite on the point. It was asked—‘An quando in priorum tabularum locum aliae substituuntur, nova requiritur facultas illas benedicendi et Viam Crucis erigendi?’ and the reply was—‘Negative,

<sup>1</sup> In places exempt from the jurisdiction of the Ordinary, e.g., chapels and houses of exempt Orders, neither his consent nor that of the parish priest is necessary.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Decrees S.C.I., Jan. 27, 1838; Sept. 25, 1841; 21 June, 1879.

<sup>3</sup> August 22, 1842, vid. etiam S.C.I., Dec. 16, 1760.

dummodo substitutio non sit majoris partis crucium.' The inference is obvious that if the greater number of the crosses has been replaced by others, a new blessing, and, consequently, a new faculty, is required; *a fortiori*, in the case submitted by our correspondent where a complete new set of crosses and pictures is substituted. As this decree indicates, the blessing and indulgences annexed to the Stations are not lost by a substitution of new pictures instead of the former ones, nor even of new crosses for some that have been impaired or broken, provided always that the substitution does not imply a renewal of the greater number of the crosses. The indulgences are attached to the crosses, not to the pictures or engravings; the latter are not essential for the valid erection of the Stations, and may be blessed or not blessed at the discretion of the priest.

(2) There is no rubric prescribing that the crosses should be fixed to the pictures. They may or may not be, according to custom or convenience, but they should be fixed to something, e.g., either to the pictures or to the wall above or below them. It is not necessary that they should be imbedded in the wall; it suffices if they are securely fixed to it. For any reasonable cause,<sup>1</sup> e.g., to paint, whiten or repair the walls, the crosses may be temporarily removed and replaced without interfering with the indulgences.

#### THE CONSENT OF THE ORDINARY IN CONNEXION WITH FACULTIES FOR BLESSING BEADS, ETC.

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly inform me if (1) faculties received for attaching indulgences to objects of piety or for the imposition of scapulars must first be presented to the Ordinary, even if the letters which confer such a power do not contain the words 'de consensu Ordinarii loci'; (2) and if the letters state expressly that such consent or 'visa' is not necessary (as in the case of Dominican faculties), must the person exercising these powers have at least faculties for confession from the Ordinary? A decree of the S. Congregation of Indulgences (June 14th, 1901) made this latter condition necessary for the valid exercise of faculties to apply Apostolic Indulgences to beads, etc. Does this imply that jurisdiction for confession must always be obtained before faculties for conferring any indulgence can be used?

SUBSCRIBER.

(1) For the valid exercise of those faculties the 'consensus ordinarii' is certainly not required, whether mention is made of it in the Rescript of Concession or not. This is clear from the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences (June 14, 1901), to which our correspondent refers. According to this decree, to exercise the faculty of applying the Apostolic and Briggittine Indulgences, the consent of the Ordinary is demanded for *liceity*, not for the validity of the act:—'Ad eam facultatem licite exercendam requiritur consensus ordinarii loci in quo quis ea uti velit firmo manente quoad Regulares exemptos decreto hujus S.C. diei 8 Junii, 1888.' There is an *a fortiori* argument if there is

<sup>1</sup> Decr. S.C.I., September 28, 1838.



no mention of it in the Rescript granting the concession. The 'consensus ordinarii,' however, is necessary for the lawful exercise of these faculties if mention is made of it in the Rescript of Concession; in the absence of such a clause it is not necessary as far as we know, except in the case of the faculty of erecting the Stations of the Cross. The following direction of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, given on 5th February, 1841, still holds good. It was asked—'Utrum qui obtinet diversas facultates ab Apostolica Sede, scilicet altaris privilegiati personalis, erigendi Stationes Viæ Crucis, benedicendi cruces, numismata, etc., debeat exhibere dictas facultates Ordinario, etiamsi nulla mentio facta sit in concessionum Rescriptis?' And the answer was—'Affirmative quoad Viæ Crucis erectionem: Negative relate ad alias facultates, nisi aliter disponatur in obtentis concessionibus.' Béringer, relying presumably on the 'explicit character of this decree, says,<sup>1</sup> in regard to the Carmelite faculties—'Ceux qui ont obtenu ces pouvoirs n'ont pas besoin, pour en faire usage, de la permission épiscopale.' What is said in the decree of faculties 'ab Apostolica Sede,' must be taken to hold equally for those granted by the Superiors-General of Religious Orders. It should be noted,<sup>2</sup> however, that if the word *privatim* occurs in the Rescript of Concession, the faculty is not to be used publicly, as, for instance, in a church or oratory where the faithful are assembled and hold in their hands the objects to be blessed.

(2) The decree of June 14, 1901, undoubtedly makes it a condition for the valid exercise of the faculty of applying the Apostolic and Brigittine Indulgences 'ut sacerdos ad excipiendas sacramentales confessiones, saltem virorum sit approbatus.' Unless, however, it is expressly ordered in the Rescript, we see no reason for extending this condition to the use of other faculties. The Apostolic and Brigittine Indulgences are peculiar and exceptional, and the rules prescribed for the conferring of them must not, without reason, be taken as a norma for the exercise of other faculties. If, however, the faculties were granted 'de consensu ordinarii,' the Bishop might insist on the recipient of them being approved for confessions in his diocese before giving his consent. This would affect the lawfulness, not the validity, of their use.

#### MASS ON AN ALTAR WITHOUT RELICS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Does custom justify me in celebrating Mass in Ireland on an altar in which there are not relics? Your solution of this question in an early issue of the I. E. RECORD will oblige

SUBSCRIBER.

Through the '*Formula Sexta*' the Irish Bishops had the privilege of celebrating Mass 'super altari portatili etiam fracto aut laeso, et sine Sanctorum reliquiis,' and of delegating this faculty to their priests. The practice was certainly *contra rubricam*, but whether its origin is to be ascribed to an immemorial custom in the Irish Church, which eventually received the express sanction of the Holy See, or was due to a formal

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 272, note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Decr. S.C.I. (1092), January 7, 1843.

petition from the Irish Bishops owing to the difficulty of procuring relics during the days of persecution, we are unable to say. At all events, whether sanctioned by immemorial custom or by express concession of the supreme authority, we think there can hardly be any longer a reasonable justification for a continuance of the practice. The faculties granted in the '*Formula Seata*' have been definitely withdrawn by a general decree of the Consistorial Congregation, dated April 25, 1918, so that the Irish Bishops are no longer empowered to grant such a concession, and even though we grant that the practice was otherwise justified by immemorial custom, the causes which accounted for its existence and toleration can, we think, no longer be urged with any show of reason. The procuring of a properly consecrated altar stone is no longer a matter of difficulty in any part of Ireland. Priests who have received the faculty from their Bishops prior to the decree of April, 1918, are justified in availing<sup>1</sup> of it unless it has been expressly withdrawn; but we venture to hope that the general withdrawal of the faculty granted in the '*Formula Seata*' will be a sufficient reminder that the law of the Church is that the Mass should be celebrated on a duly consecrated altar or altar stone. The New Code (Can. 1198, § 4) is very explicit on the necessity and importance of relics for the validity of consecration—'Tum in altare immobili tum in petra sacra sit ad normam legum liturgicarum sepulcrum continens reliquias sanctorum lapide clausum'; and the consecration is lost—'Si amoveantur reliquiae aut frangatur vel amoveatur sepulchri operculum excepto casu quo ipse Episcopus vel ejus delegatus operculum amoveat ad illud firmandum vel reparandum vel subrogandum aut ad visitandas reliquias' (Can. 1200, § 2, 2°).

#### QUERIES REGARDING THE OCTOBER DEVOTIONS. PRAYERS FOR THE POPE'S INTENTION

REV. DEAR SIR,—When the October devotions are practised at Mass :  
 (1) Is it necessary to wait until after the consecration before commencing ?  
 (2) May a decade or two of the Rosary be said before Mass begins, so as to finish the devotions before or soon after the consecration ? (3) Are prayers required to be said for the Pope's intention for the October devotions in addition to the Rosary, Litany, and Prayer to St. Joseph ? If so, will one *Pater* and *Ave* suffice, or are five *Paters* and *Aves* required ?

DOMINICK.

(1) There is no such order in any of the Roman documents prescribing the exercise of this devotion. The devotions may begin either before or after the consecration. The pertinent words of the Encyclical on the subject (30th August, 1884) are : 'quod si mane fiat, sacrum inter preces peragatur.'

(2) In the Encyclical of 1883 and the Instruction of the Propaganda of the same year, it is stated merely that it is highly desirable that the devotions should take place in connexion with the Mass, but in the Encyclical of the following year (30th August, 1884), the order is definite—'Sacrum inter preces peragatur.' While not approving of the practice,

<sup>1</sup> Can. 4.



we think, however, that the regulation would be substantially complied with in the manner described by our correspondent.

(3) There are two things to be clearly distinguished in regard to these devotions ; (a) the obligation of carrying them out in accordance with the prescription of Leo XIII ; (b) the conditions for gaining the indulgences obtainable on certain days.

(a) For the fulfilment of the obligation all that is required is the recitation of five decades of the Rosary with the Litany of Loreto and the Prayer to St. Joseph, either during the Mass in the morning, or before the Blessed Sacrament exposed (followed by Benediction) in the evening. There is no mention of special prayers for the Pope's intention.

(b) For the gaining of the indulgences, however, attached to this devotion on certain days and under certain conditions, prayers for the Pope's intentions are also prescribed. No special prayers are appointed, hence the faithful are at liberty to say any prayers they please. Nearly all authorities are agreed that five *Paters* and *Aves* fully satisfy the condition. Many eminent writers,<sup>1</sup> such as Suarez and Theodore of the Holy Spirit, hold that even a much shorter prayer—e.g., one *Our Father* and *Hail Mary*—will suffice, and they assign the very good reason that the worth of a prayer is to be estimated not so much by the length of time spent in reciting it as by the fervour and earnestness with which it is said. As to whether a purely mental prayer would suffice, authorities are not agreed, but the safer and more common opinion inclines to the necessity of the prayer being vocal. The following answers of the Congregation of Indulgences given on 18th September, 1888, distinctly favour this view :—

Q. I. Cum ad lucrandas indulgentias sive plenarias sive partiales, praescribitur ad mentem seu intentionem summi Pontificis orare, sufficiente, ut nonnulli docent, orare mentaliter ?

Et quatenus negative.

II. An sit rejicienda opinio docens recitationem devotissimam etiam unius *Pater* et *Ave* cum *Gloria Patri* sufficere ad explendam conditionem orandi pro Summi Pontificis intentione, vel potius admittenda opinio illorum qui requirunt recitationem quinque *Pater* et *Ave*, aut orationes æquivalentes ?

Quibus dubiis Sacra Congregatio rescripsit :

R. Ad I. Laudabile quidem esse mentaliter orare, orationi tamen mentali aliqua semper adjungatur oratio vocalis.

Ad II. Detur Decretum in Una Briocensi sub die 29 Maii, 1841, ad Dubium III.

The Decree of May 29, 1841, referred to in this reply, is as follows :—

Q. An sufficient quinque *Pater* et *Ave* quae recitari solent ad adimplendam Summi Pontificis intentionem quando prescriptum est ut visitetur ecclesia vel altare, ibique fundantur preces, quemadmodum, ex. gr., pro lucranda indulgentia plenaria praescriptum est associatis Operi Propagationis Fidei ? R. Preces requisitae in Indulgentiarum concessionibus ad adimplendam Summi Pontificis intentionem sunt ad unius cujusque fidelis libitum, nisi peculiariter adsignentur.

M. EATON.

<sup>1</sup> See Maurel, *Indulgences*, p. 73.

# DOCUMENTS

## STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE CARDINAL PRIMATE AND THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND ON THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THEIR COUNTRY

*(October 19, 1920)*

[The statement was issued from the general meeting of the Irish Bishops held at Maynooth on October 19, 1920, His Eminence Cardinal Logue presiding.]

It is not easy for the Pastors of the Flock to uphold the Law of God and secure its observance when oppression is rampant in a country. Where terrorism, partiality, and failure to apply the principles which its members have proclaimed, are the characteristic of government, the task is rendered well-nigh impossible. And, unhappily, by such means as these, in a most aggravated form, Ireland is now reduced to a state of anarchy.

With no feeling of complacency do we recall the fact that when the country was still crimeless we warned the Government that the oppressive measures, which they were substituting for their professions of freedom, would lead to the most deplorable consequences. The warning was in vain ; and never in living memory has the country been in such disorder as it is now.

Before the war began, and especially before the drilling and arming of Ulster, Ireland, however insistent on reform too long delayed, was in a state of order and peace. Now there are murders, raids, burnings, and violence of various kinds.

On a scale truly appalling have to be reckoned countless indiscriminate raids and arrests in the darkness of night, prolonged imprisonments without trial, savage sentences from tribunals that command and deserve no confidence, the burning of houses, town halls, factories, creameries and crops, the destruction of industries, to pave the way for want and famine, by men maddened with plundered drink and bent on loot, the flogging and massacre of civilians, all perpetrated by the forces of the Crown, who have established a reign of frightfulness which, for murdering the innocent and destroying their property, has a parallel only in the horrors of Turkish atrocities, or in the outrages attributed to the Red Army of Bolshevik Russia.

Needless to say, we are opposed to crime, from whatever side it comes. Nearly two months ago His Eminence Cardinal Logue, in condemning the murder of a policeman, wrote as follows :—



'I know that we are living under a harsh, oppressive, tyrannical regime of militarism and brute force, which invites, stimulates, and nourishes crime. I know that, latterly at least, all pretence of strict discipline has been thrown to the winds ; that those who profess to be the guardians of law and order have become the most ardent votaries of lawlessness and disorder ; that they are running wild through the country, making night hideous by raids, continual rifle-fire, burnings, and the destruction of valuable property ; that reckless and indiscriminate shootings in crowded places have made many innocent victims ; that towns are sacked as in the rude warfare of earlier ages ; that those who run through fear are shot at sight ; that in one case, lately, an inoffensive and industrious man, knowing nothing of, and caring less for, politics, has been dragged from his family while they were reciting the Rosary, and shot by the soldiers on the public road.'

Things have become much worse since this was written. Men have been tortured with barbarous cruelty. Nor are cases wanting of young women torn, undressed, from their mothers' care in the darkness of night.

For all this not the men, but their masters, are chiefly to blame. And it is not a question of hasty reprisals, which, however unjustifiable, might be attributed to extreme provocation, nor of quick retaliation on evil-doers, nor of lynch law for miscreants, much less of self-defence of any kind whatsoever. It is the indiscriminate vengeance of savages, deliberately wreaked on a whole town or countryside, without any proof of its complicity in crime, by those who ostensibly are employed by the British Government to protect the lives and property of the people and restore order in Ireland.

This went on, month after month, and there was no sign of restraint or reproof or public investigation or deterrent punishment on the part of the authorities. It went on unchecked and unabated until the world was horrified at the deeds perpetrated under a regime called government in Ireland. Then it was palliated and excused, more than half denied, and less than half rebuked, by a Minister of the Crown, on its way to being presented in a false light, and in that light equivalently condoned and approved by his superior in the British Government. Outrage has been connived at and encouraged, if not organized, not by obscure and irresponsible individuals, but by the Government of a mighty Empire, professing the highest ideals of truth and justice.

All the time the carnage of sectarian riots on a vast scale has been allowed to run its course in the cities and towns of Ulster, resulting in woeful slaughter on either side, in deprivation of employment, in the burning of shops and homes, and therefore in extermination, for the weaker party. In Belfast, a fortnight ago, 8,100 persons had registered as expelled workers, and over 23,000 people were receiving daily relief. In no other part of Ireland is a minority persecuted. Only one persecuting section can be found among the Irish people ; and perhaps recent sad events may, before it is altogether too late, open the eyes of the people of England to the iniquity of furnishing a corner of Ulster with a separate

government, or its worst instrument, a special police force, to enable it all the more readily to trample under foot the victims of its intolerants.

But it would be idle to be too confident even of that. The governing classes across the water, instead of encouraging Ulster Unionists to coalesce with the rest of the country, have used that section for centuries as a spear-head directed at the heart of Ireland. Oppression, as everyone knows, generates crime, and leads to further oppression. But more potent than even the rule of brute force, in reducing Ireland to anarchy, has been the grossly partial course taken by the British Government in regard to the North-East.

The whole British administration sat complacently while a provisional government was formed and an army drilled in Ulster, the police and customs officials held up, the roads and wires seized. Let anyone contrast the inaction of the Government on the landing of arms at Larne with the onslaughts of the military when arms were landed at Howth, or the treatment of the Ulster Volunteers as compared with the Irish Volunteers, which resulted in the arming of Orangemen and the disarming of the rest of Ireland, or of the 36th Division as compared with the 16th and the 10th. The Mutiny at the Curragh showed that, if the North-East opposed it, the benefit of law under the British Constitution was not for the rest of Ireland. The highest offices in the gift of the State were for the contingent rebels of Ulster in contrast with the bullet for Irish insurgents.

In these days we have formal approval reported of the Belfast pogrom from a Minister of the Crown, and his promise of protection under the new Belfast Parliament for all who are true to the colours. A prominent member of the British Government can scarce open his lips without encouraging antipathy to Ireland on the part of the North-East, putting 'Ulster' on its old Plantation mettle and threatening everyone that 'Ulster' will be heard from. If there is anarchy in Ireland the Ministers of the British Crown are its architects.

The plausible sentiment of not coercing Ulster is founded on false pretence, but on false pretence with a purpose. Anyone of ordinary judgment can see how undesirable it is to coerce a minority if in reason the process can at all be avoided. But to give a guarantee to a minority, in advance, against all coercion is to put a premium on unreasonableness and to make a settlement impossible. Had such pledge been given and made good to the minorities in Canada, which clung to Downing Street and resisted the concession of responsible government at home, that blessing would never have matured and created the great Dominion of our time.

It is not hatred of coercion that operates in Ireland, but partiality for the North-East. 'Ulster' must not suffer the contamination of a Dublin Parliament. But all Ireland must be coerced for the sake of the North-East, and especially Tyrone, Fermanagh, and Derry City must be put under a Belfast Parliament against their will. That is the outcome of the very acme of cruel false pretence, and, if it be pressed, we warn the British Government of the danger of bitter and prolonged civil strife, with



far greater reason for it than for the hostility to a single Parliament which, at the bidding of intolerance, the Government endorses in advance.

Not by inhuman oppression will the Irish question be settled, but by the recognition of the indefeasible right of Ireland, as of every other nation, to choose the form of Government under which its people are to live.

But, as more immediately urgent than anything else, we demand, in the name of civilization and national justice, a full inquiry into the atrocities now being perpetrated in Ireland, by such a tribunal as will inspire the confidence of all, and with immunity to witnesses from the terrorism which makes it impossible to give evidence with safety to life or property.

The Press is gagged in Ireland, the right of public meeting interdicted, and inquests suppressed. There has been brutal treatment of clergymen; and, certainly, to ban a distinguished Archbishop of Irish birth, who is the trusted leader of democracy in Australia, and prevent him from visiting his native land, is one of the most unwise steps that purblind and tyrannical oppression could take.

But still more cruel, and not less destructive of any prospect of peace between the two countries, is the continued imprisonment of the Lord Mayor of Cork and the other hunger-strikers, who think nothing of their lives if they can do anything for Ireland in the sad plight to which the rule of the stranger has reduced her.

In existing circumstances it would be idle to say to our people that the outlook was anything but menacing. It is not, however, idle, it is only what is right, to say to them that there never was a time when they should rely on God with more confidence that He will prosper their struggle for freedom while they remain steadfast to the ideals and requirements of Holy Faith. It is for a nation of martyrs to cultivate constant self-restraint. Our people were a great Christian nation when pagan chaos reigned across the Channel. They will remain, please God, a great Christian nation when the new paganism, that now prevails there, has run its evil course.

Our relations with England have been always a terrible misfortune for us. But in the end the constancy of Faith is sure to prevail. It will hasten the day of freedom and peace if we resolutely 'walk as the Children of The Light; for the fruit of The Light is in All Justice and Godliness and Truth.'

Accordingly, 'see that none renders evil for evil to any man, but ever follow that which is good towards each other and towards all men.' God is our help, as He has been through all the centuries of trial, the hope of our fathers. With His blessing upon us we need fear no foe. With His light to guide us we need dread no future.

Let us use well the all-powerful weapon of prayer on which He bids us rely; and to that end the Bishops direct that a Novena with the usual devotions be held in the churches in preparation for the feast of the Irish Saints on the 6th of next November, and that, while this trial lasts, the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, Queen of Peace, be recited after the principal Mass on days of obligation and every public Mass on other days,

They also very earnestly recommend that, in every household, along with the Rosary at night, the same Litany be said, to obtain from the Divine Mercy peace, freedom, and every blessing, spiritual and temporal, for our beloved country.

The Bishops undertake to celebrate Mass for this purpose on the 6th of November, and they request the priests of Ireland, secular and regular, so far as they are free, to do likewise.

- ✠ MICHAEL, CARDINAL LOGUE, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland.
- ✠ WILLIAM, Archbishop of Dublin, and Primate of Ireland.
- ✠ JOHN, Archbishop of Cashel.
- ✠ THOMAS, Archbishop of Tuam.
- ✠ ABRAHAM, Bishop of Ossory.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Raphoe.
- ✠ ROBERT, Bishop of Cloyne.
- ✠ JOSEPH, Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.
- ✠ DENIS, Bishop of Ross.
- ✠ THOMAS, Bishop of Galway and Kilmacduagh.
- ✠ MICHAEL, Bishop of Killaloe.
- ✠ LAURENCE, Bishop of Meath.
- ✠ CHARLES, Bishop of Derry.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Clogher.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Kilmore.
- ✠ PATRICK, Bishop of Achonry.
- ✠ JAMES, Bishop of Killala.
- ✠ BERNARD, Bishop of Elphin.
- ✠ DANIEL, Bishop of Cork.
- ✠ JOSEPH, Bishop of Down and Connor.
- ✠ BERNARD, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore.
- ✠ EDWARD, Bishop of Dromore.
- ✠ CHARLES, Bishop of Kerry.
- ✠ WILLIAM, Bishop of Ferns.
- ✠ DENIS, Bishop of Limerick.
- ✠ THOMAS, Bishop of Clonfert.
- ✠ EDWARD, Bishop of Spigaz.



APOSTOLIC LETTER TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF  
ST. ANDREWS AND EDINBURGH AND THE OTHER BISHOPS  
OF SCOTLAND, CONCERNING THE SCOTCH COLLEGE AT  
ROME

(July 25, 1920)

EPISTOLAE

AD RR. PP. DD. IACOBUM AUGUSTINUM, ARCHIEPISCOPUM S. ANDREAE  
ET EDIMBURGEN., CETEROSQUE SCOTIAE EPISCOPOS DE URBANO  
SCOTORUM COLLEGIO TUENDO ET AMPLIFICANDO

Venerabiles fratres, salutam et apostolicam benedictionem.—Optime profecto et immortaliter meruisse de natione vestra dicendus est Decessor Noster Clemens VIII, condito in hac alma Urbe Collegio Scotorum ob eam quidem causam, ut delecti adolescentes bonae spei, cum ibi ad sacra rite instituti essent, redeuntes in patriam sacerdotes sempiternae civium suorum saluti providerent. Etenim qui ex ea disciplina usque adhuc prodierunt sacrorum administri, iis magnas utilitates debet acceptas referre Scotia; debet in primis quod in illa superiorum temporum infelicitate, cum tantopere divexaretur publice catholica fides, non funditus penitusque eam amisit. At vero, quominus id Collegium omnem fructuum copiam quae sperari poterat, efferret, rei familiaris angustiae prohibuerunt, quibus mature laborare coepit. Instruxit illud quidem idoneis redditibus Clemens conditor: sed ii variis subinde casibus sensim imminuti sunt adeo, ut maxima ex parte demum defecerint. Nec ceteroquin opportunum subsidium exspectandum erat ab ista Ecclesia, quae summis tum difficultatibus conflictabatur. Quod si sub initio saeculi superioris apud vos, augescente fidelium numero, licuit rei catholicae ab illa diuturna vexatione spirare et aliquem in dies progressum ad meliora facere, non tamen urbano huic Collegio melius est factum, cuius rationibus plane exitiosa et fatalis accidit Europaei belli calamitas. Itaque Nos, de hac sane gravi causa solliciti, haud ita pridem vos, venerabiles fratres, per collegas vestros duos, qui Apostolorum *limina* visitatum adierant, vehementer hortati sumus, ut de ope huic nationis vestrae Collegio ferenda communiter Scotos catholicos appellaretis. Rei successus, Deo favente, vicit exspectationem Nostram: siquidem ea pecuniae vis est a vobis, stipes corrogando, collecta, quae et facultatem Collegio dederit ad se aere alieno liberandum, et fecerit etiam ut ipsum posthac esset solvendo. In quo cum sedulitas et instantia vestra, venerabiles fratres, tum fidelis populi, praesertim tenuiorum ordinum, est largitas dilaudanda: compertum est enim eam summam maxime esse ex operariae plebis collatione confectam.—Iam reliquum est, ut de hoc tantae opportunitatis Instituto non solum tuendo, sed amplificando cogitatis. Omnino enim oportet ipsum ad Ecclesiae istius incrementa tum respondere, tum etiam conducere; ob eamque rem necesse est ad eius opes tantum adiungi, unde cum alumnorum numerum queat sustentare, qui satis esse videatur. Id vos effectum dare pro vestra sollertia et diligentia pastoralis nitemiri, stimulos scilicet admoventes propensissimae vestrorum voluntati: nec dubitandum quin operam posituri in hoc satis

valde frugiferam. Sed quia res eo succedet uberior, quo fuerit ordinatior, ideo cupimus optamusque, ut singuli vos ipsi vestrum clerum quotannis huius adiutandi Collegii admoneatis; populum autem per sacerdotes vestros item quotannis in singulis Scotiae missionibus admonendum curetis. Qui vero has ad populum contiones habebunt, nimirum explicabunt diligentius, quae sit haec Romana Scotorum domus, quis eius finis, quid utilitatis inde iam Scoti acceperint, et quantum eorum intersit, usque magis eam florere. Equidem, explorata fidelium e Scotia pietate ac studio erga Apostolicam Sedem, pro certo habemus eos optatis Nostris cumulate satisfacturos, modis omnibus ornando urbanum suae gentis clericorum Collegium, in quo singulare ipsorum cum Ecclesiae catholicae Capite coniunctionis vinculum consistit.—Auspiciem autem divinorum, quae precamur, munerum, eandemque summae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, apostolicam benedictionem vobis, venerabiles fratres, et clero populoque vestro amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, die xxv mensis iulii, in festo S. Iacobi Apostoli, mcmxx, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

#### THE PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF FRENCH GUINEA, IN WEST AFRICA, IS ERECTED INTO A VICARIATE APOSTOLIC

(April 27, 1920)

PRAEFECTURA APOSTOLICA GUINEAE GALLICAE IN AFRICA OCCIDENTALI IN VICARIATUM APOSTOLICUM ERIGITUR

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Supremi apostolatus munus, quo in terris divinitus fungimur, Nos monet ut ea sollicito studio decernamus, quae in exploratam cedant christianae plebis utilitatem. Iamvero, ut in Praefectura Apostolica Guineae Gallicae in Africa Occidentali catholicum nomen impensius promoveatur, atque christiana fides maiora in dies incrementa capiat, cum opportunum visum sit concilium eandem Praefecturam provehere ad Vicariatum Apostolicum, Nos, omnibus rei momentis attente perpensis cum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositis, haec quae, infra habentur, idcirco statuenda existimavimus. Nimirum quo satius religionis incremento in ea regione consultum sit, Praefecturam Apostolicam Guineae Gallicae in Africa Occidentali in Vicariatum Apostolicum, auctoritate Nostra, vi praesentium, erigimus, iisdem limitibus servatis ac nomine Guineae Gallicae. Non obstantibus constitutionibus et sanctionibus apostolicis ceterisque omnibus, licet speciali atque individua mentione ac derogatione dignis, in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die xvii aprilis mcmxx, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

P. CARD. GASPAREL, *a Secretis Status*.



THE FACULTY OF CONFERRING THE DOCTORATE IS GRANTED  
TO THE ORIENTAL PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE

(September 25, 1920)

FACULTAS FIT PONTIFICIO INSTITUTO ORIENTALI DOCTORALES LAUREAS  
CONFERENDI

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Quod Nobis in condendo Pontificio Instituto Orientali proposueramus, ut, quantum in Nobis erat, antiquo catholicarum Orientis regionum decori restituendo consuleremus, id feliciter iam nunc evenire, ex iis quae, dilectus filius Ildephonsus Schuster, Abbas et Ordinarius S. Pauli extra Moenia, Praeses Pontifici Instituti Orientalis, nuper ad Nos attulit, permagna sane cum iucunditate comperimus; placuit enim accipere, plures iam ex utroque clero discipulos curriculum studiorum, quod, Litteris die xv mensis octobris anni MCMXVII datis, constituimus, uberrimo cum fructu exegisse. Opportunum igitur videtur, rem tam prospere, Deo dante, inceptam sic provehi, ut maiora in dies incrementa capiat et copiosiores afferat utilitates, quibus in primis catholicae Ecclesiae Orientalis Patriarchae atque sacrorum Antistites merito delectentur, qui Instituti ipsius exordia et coram et scriptis Nobis sunt gratulati. Itaque ut piam alumnos inter aemulationem alamus honestumque laboris certamen promoveamus, utque simul doctores variis disciplinis in Instituto tradendis probe noverint quanti eorum peritiam diligentemque operam faciamus, re accurate perpensa conlatisque consiliis cum dilecto filio Nostro Nicolao S. R. E. Diacono Cardinali Marini, Sacrae Congregationis pro Ecclesia Orientali secretario, apostolica auctoritate Nostra, harum Litterarum vi, Pontificio Instituto Orientali concedimus in perpetuum, ut, perinde atque aliae studiorum Universitates vel Academiae in Urbe existentes, doctorales laureas, in ecclesiasticis dumtaxat disciplinis quae ad Orientales christianas gentes attinent, conferre possit ac valeat alumnis ex utroque clero, cum latino tum orientali, qui eiudsem Instituti scholas, secundum leges et statuta ipsius propria ac per nos probata, biennium celebraverint et, facto scientiae suae periculo, cum voce tum scriptis, coram academico doctorum coetu, maiorem suffragiorum numerum retulerint. Praesentes vero Litteras, quibus Nobis videmur utiliter Instituti ipsius incremento consuluisse, decernimus firmas, validas atque efficaces semper exstare ac permanere, suosque plenos atque integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere, illisque ad quos pertinet, sive pertinere poterunt, nunc et in posterum amplissime suffragari, sicque rite iudicandum esse ac definiendum, irritumque ex nunc et inane fieri si quidquam secus super his, a quovis, auctoritate qualibet, scienter sive ignoranter attentari contigerit. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuslibet.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die xxv mensis septembris MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

**THE PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF LOWER NIGERIA, IN WEST AFRICA, IS ERECTED INTO A VICARIATE APOSTOLIC WITH THE TITLE OF SOUTHERN NIGERIA**

(April 26, 1920)

[The Decree was published in October, 1920.]

PRAEFECTURA APOSTOLICA NIGERIAE INFERIORIS IN AFRICA OCCIDENTALI  
IN VICARIATUM APOSTOLICUM ERIGITUR TITULO NIGERIAE MERIDIONALIS

**BENEDICTUS PP. XV**

Ad futuram rei memoriam.—Quae catholico nomini aeternaeque fidelium saluti bene, prospere ac feliciter eveniant, ea ut sollicito studio praestemus Nos admonet supremi Apostolatus munus, quo in terris divinitus fungimur. Iamvero ut fructus uberiores in Praefectura Apostolica Nigeriae Inferioris in Africa Occidentali divini Verbi praedicatio in dies ferre valeat, cum, attentis etiam sacrarum aedium multiplicitate, aucto institutorum fideliumque numero, ac populi pietate in praedicta Missione feliciter progrediente, opportunum visum sit consilium enunciatam Praefecturam in Apostolicum Vicariatum erigere, Nos, omnibus rei momentis attente perpensis cum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositis, haec quae, infra scripta sunt idcirco decernenda existimavimus. Nimirum ut fidelium illarum regionum spirituali bono satis provideamus, apostolica Nostra auctoritate, praesentium tenore, Praefecturam Apostolicam Nigeriae Inferioris in Africa Occidentali in Vicariatum Apostolicum erigimus, actualibus limitibus servatis, illique nomen facimus Nigeriae Meridionalis. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et sanctionibus apostolicis, ceterisque omnibus speciali licet atque individua mentione ac derogatione dignis in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die XVI aprilis MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri anno sexto.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.



## REVIEWS AND NOTES

HINTS ON READING AND PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Rev. P. A. Beecher, M.A., D.D., Professor of Sacred Eloquence, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Dublin: Fallon Brothers, Dame Court.

'THERE is no art of speaking any more than there is an art of writing . . . Oratorical and literary success has never but one cause, absolute sincerity.' So said Rénan, but Rénan is in error. There is an art of speaking as well as an art of writing. Sincerity and conviction, of course, are of great utility to the speaker, but they do not suffice him. Were it only necessary to be convinced of being right to make others share our opinion, plaintiffs would have no need to provide themselves with an advocate; they would plead their cause better in person. The art of speaking is simply the art of presenting the truth in its most persuasive form, and this art can be taught like all others.

Unfortunately the manuals on the subject have not been always helpful towards smoothing the way to success in this difficult department. There is a danger of being so elementary as to be of little use, or so technical as to be of use only to those who can dispense with manuals. And artificiality and dullness are two other pitfalls that have claimed victims. Now, within brief and precise outline we have presented to us in the little volume under review the mature reflections of one of the greatest pulpit orators of the day. The idea of reading through a book on Elocution is as antecedently repellent for most people as the reading of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. But here an agreeable surprise awaits us. The book, notwithstanding its didactic character, is written in a powerful, rhythmical style and as an appreciation of some of the masterpieces of literature, introduced by way of illustration, it will richly repay the reading. You feel with pleasure that you have abandoned the age-beaten track of platitudes for the 'fresh fields and pastures new' that a genuine artist has opened up. The old rule of thumb method is discarded and naturalness is set up as the ideal in speaking; and in place of disquisitions on the angle of gesture and gesticulation the book is enriched with quotations and examples from the great masters of speech and style. The art of speaking cannot be divorced from the art of writing, and so the author is careful to direct the student in the choice of works for study and imitation, while always insisting on the paramount necessity of individuality. Here the reader is presented with a bouquet from Shelley, there with the finest flower of Byron's genius; here the secret of Daniel O'Connell's oratorical power is revealed, there it is a note on the diction of Browning with 'his

thought-burrs that stick better than roses'; and everywhere Shakespeare and Newman.

The various styles of oratory from the point of view of delivery are treated in comprehensive detail, and the author directs attention to the 'fine, natural, flexible tones of the ordinary conversational speech.' But occasions will demand the 'Full Delivery,' and under this heading Dr. Beecher has an interesting study on the value of the emotions. His advice is to 'trust the emotion as a good rider would trust his horse, but to hold the rein of naturalness sufficiently tight to keep it from running into bombast or grandiloquence.' A special chapter is devoted to the Oratorical Pause, and its great possibilities in invective, as instanced in the introduction and peroration of O'Connell's speech for Magee.

Sound advice, too, is given in matters of practical importance: how to combat self-consciousness and nervousness, how to memorise with facility, how to deliver the memorised discourse so that it will not be 'redolent of the manuscript.'

Exigencies of space preclude reference to many other points. The excellent analysis of Newman's prose in the Appendix is especially noteworthy. For Dr. Beecher's old students this little volume will recall the memories of his absorbingly interesting lectures, and many an enthusiastic new reader will now make his acquaintance for the first time. Irishmen are credited with an inherent power of oratory, and yet the educational system that has been foisted upon us takes but little account of this natural asset of ours. We venture to predict that this thoughtful study from the pen of an accomplished orator will contribute in a practical way to remedy the apathy that suffers the choking of this spring of our intellectual life.

T. F.

LEABHAR CHLAINNE SUIBHNE. By Rev. Paul Walsh, M.A. Dublin: Dollard.

RECENT events have focussed attention upon a name which has been associated with Irish history from earliest times.

Fortunately, at this moment, one of Ireland's foremost scholars in the editing of Irish texts, the Rev. Paul Walsh, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Maynooth, has supplied us with the information we require in editing a Manuscript which he entitles the *Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne*, or 'The Book of the MacSweeneys.' So far history has been written without that critical appreciation of the origin of the names and crystallization of clans, which makes the beginner almost despair of the reliability of anything he reads. Such patient labour as that of Father Walsh is gradually preparing the way, and may make it as interesting as a scientific treatise on the cotton industry to a resident of Manchester.

The clan whose story here is told was never a dominant clan. Territorially they seem to have settled down in Fanad, Donegal, about A.D. 1200. This seems to have been the unhappy source of the error of attributing a Scottish ancestry to the clan. As this is an error involving a misconception of facts of a prime order, it may be well to clear the matter up.



A superficial glance through the Annals will show us that the people were divided chiefly according to territorial boundaries, the Ulidians, Lagenians, Braigi, and generally the men of such and such a territory; the prominent men, previous to the fixing of nomenclatures of clan and territory, were known by the addition of their father's name; thus there were several eminent men bearing the name Suibhne, such as Suibhne Menn, Poet and Ard-ri of Ireland; St. Suibhne, abbot of Iona; Suibhne, abbot of Clonmacnoise, who was present at the foundation of Oxford; but there is no evidence beyond the name that these men of various periods belonged to the same clan or had any relationship of blood other than racial. A bearer of the name assumed it as the patronymic of the clan about A.D. 1200. Again, we must remember, that it was at this time almost precisely that Scotland came to be known as such, and Ireland as Ireland. This Suibhne was a son of Donnsluibhe, son of Aodh Aluinn, son of Anradhan. Anradhan left Ireland rather than usurp the kingship of his brother Domnall, conquered half Scotland and married the King of Scotland's daughter. That, says the Manuscript, was the first conquest ever made by Clann Suibhne in Scotland. But should Suibhne return to Fanad and find himself treated as a Scotchman in the modern sense of the term would be as surprising as it would be a pride to him to accept it in its real original sense. The Mac Sweeney clan, as sprung from this Suibhne, may claim to be Scots in the sense of the word when Scot meant Irish and nothing outside it, and to be kinsfolk of the descendants of his brother Domnall, who did not leave Ireland, but whose descendants' clan names I do not know. The clan were, as we said, never a dominant clan, but were always allied by marriage with the heads of the dominant clans. They were professional fighters or gallowglasses, hiring themselves out for service and placing their axes at the command now of O'Neill against O'Donnell, again of O'Donnell versus O'Neill, or of both against the English invaders. It is said of them that they all lived by fighting, and most of them died fighting. It is rare to find one who was not slain in battle.

Having concluded his account of Mac Suibhne, Fanad, Father Paul Walsh says, 'We have thus far followed the fortunes of the main branch during a period of more than four hundred years. No other family in Tirconnell, except only the O'Donnells, can present such an unbroken record.' Outside the three celebrated settlements in Donegal, viz., Fanad, Banagh, and na dTuath, there were sub-divisions, viz., Mac Suibhne Connachtach, Urmhumhan, Deasmhumhan, Chula Cnamh, Cloinne Riocaird. The Munster branch settled down in Muskerry, near Macroom, and in Carbery in alliance with Mac Carthy.

It would be tedious here to examine into the clan's history, except to state that, in common with the rest of Ireland, they suffered the loss of their land and power under Elizabeth and Cromwell. The Manuscript edited by Father Walsh gives us a history of their fortunes till the year 1518. It is extremely interesting apart from the object with which it expressly deals, and, as we are told, it was written to the command of a Princess Mary of that name. We will quote our narrator's

account of this patroness, who lived at a period when Irish 'savagery' ruled the land.

It was this Mac Sweeney who first built the castle of Rathmullen; and it was his wife, Marie O'Malley, who erected the monastery of Rathmullen. They brought to the monastery a community from Munster in 1516. The prior was Suibhne, son of Aodh of the Mac Suibne Chonnachtach. Two years after, Mac Suibhne died, aged seventy-eight. He was the most illustrious constable of these later days and most liberal towards the poets and the schools. He was buried in the habit of the friars of Mary, in the monastery he had founded in her honour, on the 7th April, in his own seat of Rath Mullen. And at the end of four years after that, his noble, lovable wife, daughter of O'Malley, the most generous and best of mothers, and most famous in her times for faith and piety, died. She passed her days in this manner: she heard Mass once, and sometimes more than once, each day; three days each week she spent on bread and water fare, with Lenten and Winter fast and the Golden Fridays. She had erected a great hall for the Friars Minor in Donegal. She built many other churches in the provinces of Ulster and Connacht. She had this book of piety copied in her own house, and all affirm that in her time there was no woman who passed her life better than she.

The types presented in this brief notice have been handed on to the descendants of the race, and the memory of them will serve as a barrier to our becoming mere cyphers in a servile state. Though the chain of direct genealogical evidence was smashed, as regards documentary evidence, for their descendants by the forces, laws, and penalties to which they were subjected, there still lasts the memory and ties which bind us to the clans from which we spring.

The clan system was so integral an element in the political and social organization of Ireland that a detailed treatment of the history of a single clan, such as is to be found in the work so ably edited by Father Walsh, is of the utmost importance in helping to an understanding of the conditions of life in Ireland in the centuries that have passed, at the moment when her traditions were most violently assailed, and, indeed, as an index to much in the features of the social and political life of Ireland to-day.

M.

ST. PAUL: HIS LIFE, LETTERS, AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By A. H. McNeile, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. Cambridge: University Press. 1920.

THE aim of this book is, the author tells us, to bring together briefly the results of modern inquiry into the life, work, and theology of St. Paul. In a brief Introduction Dr. McNeile discusses the text, trustworthiness, and chronology of the Acts of the Apostles. It is difficult to grasp precisely his point of view in regard to the value of the D-text. He has apparently not read Zahn's exhaustive book on that question—though it was published in 1916. He has but a moderate respect for the accuracy and



honesty of St. Luke. While admitting that the 'We-passages' are written in the same language and style as the rest of the Acts, he suggests that Luke may have used another person's notes in those passages, and re-written them, leaving the first person plural standing. Yet, as no other companion of St. Paul who might have written the original notes can be indicated, perhaps, after all, Luke is the original author of the 'We-passages'! (p. xi. seq.). This method of suggesting a radical view and then shrinking back to a conservative position is frequently used throughout the book. In his chronological scheme the author puts the conversion of St. Paul in A.D. 39—being led to this view apparently by the difficulties arising out of the conflict of Herod Antipas with the Nabathean king, Aretas IV. (See Prof. M'Neile's note in his Commentary on St. Matthew, p. 211 seq.). The first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem after his conversion is put in 42, and, since in Gal. ii. 1 the reading *four* years instead of *fourteen* years is accepted, the Apostle's second visit to Jerusalem is put in 46. This second visit is identified with the 'alms-visit' (Acts xi. 29 seq.). The arrival of Paul in Corinth is assigned to the autumn of 50. Paul was arrested in Jerusalem at the Pentecost of 57, and reached Rome early in 60 A.D.

The body of the work is divided into three sections, which are devoted respectively to the life, letters, and doctrine of St. Paul.

The section dealing with the Apostle's life (pp. 1-120) is written in a highly interesting fashion. St. Paul's career as a missionary is set vividly before us, and his character and motives are skilfully analysed. There is, however, all through this section a tendency to naturalism, a tendency to exclude supernatural factors of all kinds from the explanation of St. Paul's success.

Dr. M'Neile is a determined adherent of the 'South Galatian' school. He seems to think, unfortunately, that the popularity with recent writers of the 'South Galatian' theory absolves him from a really genuine examination of its advantages and its difficulties. Though his ambition is, as he says in the Preface, to give the substance of the *best* modern work on St. Paul, he shows no trace of familiarity with Catholic studies in any section of his book. He nowhere alludes to the valuable work of Lagrange or Jacquier or Prat. In his case, as indeed in that of nearly all modern Protestant scholars, *Catholica non leguntur* is sadly true. In his study of the findings of the Council of Jerusalem he is somewhat vacillating and indefinite, and he goes out of his way to make the strange statement: 'Had the Council . . . upheld the Judaizers, it would not have moved Paul a hair's breadth from his purpose. He would have continued his successful work among the Gentiles on the lines that he felt had been drawn by God' (p. 45).

The very vexed question of the visit to Jerusalem referred to in Gal. ii. 1-10 is treated rather summarily. On p. 27 is the remarkable assertion: 'There is really nothing to connect the visit of Gal. ii. 1-10 with the Council.' Thus all the subtle proofs so often put forward by brilliant writers to establish the identity of the visit in Gal. ii. with the visit to Jerusalem for the Council have been simply much ado about nothing.

There is no indication in Dr. M'Neile's treatment of Gal. ii. 1-10 that he has looked into the recent work of the Catholic scholar, Professor Weber of Würzburg on the relations between Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv. The painstaking study of the same problem by the Protestant scholar, Dr. Plooj, in his *Chronologie van het leven van Paulus*, has also obviously failed to be included in the 'best' modern work summarized by Dr. M'Neile. The incident between St. Paul and St. Peter referred to in Gal. ii. 11-14 is put before the Council of Jerusalem.

St. Paul's first visit to Philippi (Acts xvi.) gives Dr. M'Neile an opportunity of suggesting his own theories as to St. Paul's method of working and St. Luke's method of writing. The slave-girl with the 'Pythonic spirit,' was simply 'a ventriloquist and a fortune-teller'; and so, 'the character of St. Paul with its electric energy and intense spiritual fervour at once had a psychological effect on her.' The outcome was that she shouted forth 'words corresponding with the thoughts that must have been uppermost in St. Paul's mind'—and lost her power of ventriloquising. Did she lose the gift of fortune-telling also? Dr. M'Neile does not tell us how the fortune-telling was connected with the ventriloquising. If the slave-girl was not possessed by a demon, but was simply a common fortune-teller with a turn for ventriloquism, how did Paul's 'electric' energy and 'spiritual' fervour make her profitless for her employers? No doubt the author is repeating here what others have said, but why explain *obscurum per obscurius*? Is this the 'best' that modern exegesis can do?

The account of St. Paul's release from prison at Philippi contains, we are told (p. 61), elements 'which can scarcely claim the same historical value as the preceding We-section.' But above we were told that Luke himself wrote the 'We-passages' (p. xii.). If an author is unreliable on one important point, why expect him to be trustworthy anywhere? Or are we to assume that only where the wonderful or supernatural is absent, the narrative is reliable?

In the second section of the work (pp. 121-264) there are very interesting introductions to the Pauline letters. The arguments of the letters are summarized and the summaries are admirably clear and ought to be of much value to students. There are several points in this section which deserve mention.

To the third missionary tour are assigned the letters to the Galatians and the Philippians. Galatians was probably written from Corinth—just before Romans (about A.D. 56), and Philippians was written probably at Ephesus. Dr. M'Neile does not fully explain how an upholder of the South Galatian theory can date Galatians from Corinth on the third apostolic tour. Romans xvi. 1-23 may be a letter to Ephesus, and 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 may be a fragment of the first letter to Corinth. 2 Cor. x.-xiii. is not a fragment of the so-called 'sorrowful letter' (2 Cor. ii. 4) to Corinth: that letter has been altogether lost. Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written during the first imprisonment in Rome. Indeed there was no second imprisonment there, for St. Paul's execution will have brought to a close the imprisonment referred to in Acts. Hence



Paul must have been executed about A.D. 62, before the Neronian persecution began! Is this probable? What of the ancient tradition about a journey to the extreme west? The Pastoral Epistles are not Pauline, we are told, but 2 Tim. iv. 9-22 may be a genuine fragment of a letter written by Paul while in prison in Cæsarea. The Epistle to the Hebrews is not discussed.

The section on the Doctrine of St. Paul (pp. 265-307) is claimed by the author in the Preface to be mainly the product of his own independent thought. It makes one wish that the author had been more self-reliant in the earlier sections. It is very suggestive. It aims at complete objectivity. There is no foolish riding-to-death of such themes as 'mystery religions' or 'sacramentalism,' but an effort is made to state simply (with exhaustive references) St. Paul's teaching on all fundamental points of doctrine. The treatment is distinctly helpful; but it is not, of course, of the kind that meets the needs of Catholic students. Here, again, one cannot help thinking what a pity it is that Dr. McNeile did not find time to read Prat on the Theology of St. Paul, or some one of the many excellent Catholic commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. Yet one must be grateful that the author of this work has avoided in great measure the fanciful theories of so many even of the writers whose works are included in the catalogue of Pauline literature in English given at the end of his book.

The book contains two excellent maps illustrating St. Paul's missionary tours, and a good index. The whole book is beautifully printed.

P. BOYLAN.

**THE PASSION AND GLORY OF CHRIST.** By Mgr. F. X. Poelzl, Professor of Theology at the University of Vienna. Translated from the German by A. M. Buchanan, M.A. Revised and edited by Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. New York: Joseph F. Wagner. London: Herder.

DR. POELZL's five volume commentary on the Gospels has been long and favourably known to Catholic students who could read German. His treatment of the Gospels was very unusual in at least one point. While dealing in four volumes with the four Gospels separately down to the point where the story of the Last Supper begins, he combined into a fifth volume the treatment of the whole Gospel narrative from the Last Supper to the Ascension. This fifth and last (and probably best) volume of his Commentary—*Die Leidens- und Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu Christi* is now available in an English translation, which has been revised and edited by Father Martindale.

Though this fifth volume of Poelzl's Commentary appeared in a second German edition in 1913, I cannot find any reference to this fact either on the title page or in the preface of the English version. I assume, however, that the translation must have been made from the 1913 edition, for I have compared a number of passages in the translation selected with a view to finding traces of the second German edition, with the German text of that edition, and everywhere I have found such traces.

The rendering of the German is almost invariably admirable. The translator has never slavishly followed the German construction, but he has produced a genuine English equivalent of the original.

The editor or translator has frequently made useful additions to Poelzl's text by summarizing the views of recent writers on much debated points. In the German work the harmonized Gospel-text is throughout immediately followed by critical notes on grammar, text, history, and archæology. These notes do not appear in the English work. Possibly it was felt that they might frighten off the general reader. Yet one cannot help thinking that the English book would have been much more useful to students if the notes had been retained. The foot-note references to literature in the German edition are often abridged, and sometimes quite omitted in the translation. As if to make up for this, a list of the books most often referred to by Dr. Poelzl is given at the end of the English work.

This translation is a very valuable addition to the small library of Catholic books on Scripture in English. It can be warmly recommended to ecclesiastical students and to priests, as well as to the general reader. There is no other work in English which contains so much reliable information on the Gospel narrative of Our Lord's death and resurrection.

P. BOYLAN.

### BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED

- America* : A Catholic Review (October).  
*The Ecclesiastical Review* (October). U.S.A.  
*The Rosary Magazine* (October). Somerset, Ohio.  
*The Catholic World* (October). New York.  
*The Austral Light* (September). Melbourne.  
*The Ave Maria* (October). Notre Dame, Indiana.  
*The Catholic Bulletin* (October). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Irish Monthly* (October). Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Month* (October). London : Longmans.  
*Études* (October). Paris : 12 Rue Oudinot (VII<sup>e</sup>).  
*Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* (October). Paris : Beauchesne.  
*Revue du Clergé Français* (October). Paris : Letouzey et Ané.  
*The Fortnightly Review* (October). St. Louis, Mo.  
*The Lamp* (October). Garrison, N.Y.  
*Revue des Jeunes* (October). Paris : 3 Rue de Luynes.  
*Sister Mary of St. Philip*. By a Sister of Notre Dame. London : Longmans, Green & Co.  
*Excerpta e 'Rituali Parvo.'* Cura Rev. J. B. O'Connell. Dublin : Duffy & Co.



# THE THREE SCOTO-IRISH HERMITS OF GRIESSTETTEN

By DOM PATRICK NOLAN, O.S.B., M.A.

IN the following pages an attempt is made to rescue from oblivion the memory of three Scotie, i.e., Irish or Scoto-Irish, hermits who lived and died some eight hundred years ago in an obscure corner of Bavaria.<sup>1</sup> Like so many of their countrymen, to use the words of an ancient Irish monk of Ratisbon, they 'left behind dear friends and possessions, and, spurning temporal things for things eternal, they passed over so many seas, so many trackless wastes, to follow Christ.' It had been their wish to pass their lives unknown to the outer world, wrapt up in God and heavenly contemplation, and, if their wishes had been consulted, their very names would have been forgotten. But it was the will of God that the light of their saintly lives, which they would have hidden under a bushel, should be raised aloft, and exposed to the admiring gaze of men.

So obscure, indeed, was the memory of these holy men for many centuries, that it even escaped the observation of the all-scrutinizing gaze of the Bollandists, who, from their hagiological observatory in Brussels, pass in review the lives of holy men and holy women throughout the whole Catholic world. And, if we may be permitted to push our astronomical metaphor a little farther, it was only when their bodies, long at rest, were set in motion—that their existence was once more revealed to the world—just as the presence of some obscure planetoid or comet becomes known when its motion has made a faint streak on the sensitive film of the photographer.

In other words, the bodies of our three saints were solemnly translated on the 12th of June, 1689, by the

<sup>1</sup> i.e., at Griesstetten, a little hamlet of about fifty inhabitants, about twenty minutes' walk from Dietfurt on the Altmühl, Upper Palatinate. It has been a place of pilgrimage since the twelfth century.

Right Rev. Coadjutor-Bishop of Ratisbon, Albert Ernest Count von Wartenberg, who drew up a narrative of the translation and sent it to the Bollandists. The latter have printed it in their bulky tomes, under the date mentioned, and preface it with the remark that they had never before heard of the saints, and that they had even escaped the observation of the learned Matthæus Raderus, who has written a monumental work on the Saints of Bavaria.

What little information I have been able to put before the reader in the following pages, I have obtained chiefly from four sources : (1) From the above-mentioned documents, published by the Bollandists. (2) From a historical sketch of the lives and cultus of the hermits, drawn up in the year 1850 by Dom Anselm Robertson, O.S.B., from documents in the archives of the Scotie monastery at Ratisbon, and published in the *Spicilegium Benedictinum* (Dec., 1899), from an authenticated copy in the archives of the monastery of St. Paul's, Rome. (3) From a petition drawn up in 1848 by the then Bishop of Ratisbon (J. B. Weigl), concerning the cultus of the hermits. This document is to be found likewise in the *Spicilegium* (March, 1900). (4) From a little German brochure, *Die drei Elenden Heiligen zu Griesstetten*, by a Franciscan, published at Ingolstadt, 1906.

As Dom Anselm's sketch gives a concise and connected account of the lives of the three hermits, as far as the facts can be ascertained, I shall give a translation, from the original Latin, of the principal portions—merely premising that all his statements are not to be accepted as historically accurate. I need hardly remark that he and his Scottish brethren were not of the same nationality as the 'Scoti' or Irish, who originally founded the monastery of Ratisbon. The latter were pure Celts from ancient 'Scotia' or Ireland, with perhaps a sprinkling of members from the Irish colony in Scotland. Dom Anselm Robertson and his brethren were modern Scots, by which we mean a nationality which had its origin somewhere about the time of the Norman Conquest—and in which a predominant element was Saxon.

And here it may not be out of place to say a few words as to the proper signification, in mediæval Latin, of the words 'Scotia' and 'Scoti,' which are still frequently misunderstood by foreigners, and even by many of us nearer home. Most of my readers are aware that the latinized name 'Scoti' was originally applied to the last of the



ancient colonizers of Ireland, in other words, to the progenitors of the Irish race. It seems to be derived from the Celtic 'Scotraide,' which was the name of the predominant tribe. From them Ireland was called 'Scotia' (by Latin writers) from about the sixth till the thirteenth centuries.

These Scoti or Irish made a permanent settlement in the north of Britain about the year 500 A.D., when Fergus Mac Erc, chief of the Dalriads of Antrim, with Lorne and Angus, led a colony into the modern Argyle and the Isles, and thus began the long line of Irish kings who held sway in Scotland from the reign of Aedhan Mac Gabhran (crowned by St. Columba in the year 574) till that of Donald Bain, who was deprived of his kingdom, and of his eyes, by the Saxon, Edgar Atheling, in the year 1097. From these Irish, or 'Scoti,' the north of Britain began to be called Scotia, somewhere about the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. Ireland, the home of the Scots, was for some two centuries longer still called Scotia, and by some writers Scotia Major, or Greater Scotia, to distinguish it from the new Scotia, which the Irish were building up in the north of Britain.

It cannot be too clearly realized [says Mr. Plummer, in his scholarly edition of St. Bede] that at the time when Bede wrote [his Ecclesiastical History, about the year 731], and for more than two centuries after, the term 'Scottia' refers to Ireland, and to Ireland alone. It was only towards the end of the tenth century that it began to be used of any part of Britain; and even then it was applied to a very limited district, and only gradually during two more centuries was the application extended to the whole of the northern kingdom. . . . Of course the tribe name 'Scotti' would apply to any member of the Irish race, whether living in Ireland or in Britain.

The same author quotes the following passage from *The Chronicles of the Picts and Scots* (ed. Skene): 'Scotois . . . lour propre pays est Ireland, lour coustoum et patoys acordaunt, qi puis furount mellez od Pices,' i.e., 'The Scots . . . their proper country is Ireland, their customs and language agreeing thereto, though they afterwards became mingled with the Picts.' 'It is not safe to count,' says Burton,<sup>1</sup> 'that the word Scot must mean a native of present Scotland, when the period dealt with is earlier than the middle of the twelfth century.'

And now that my readers have got a clearer idea of the meaning of the expressions 'Scotia' and 'Scoti,' I shall

<sup>1</sup> *History of Scotland*, 1873, i. 207.

venture to quote some passages from the Bollandists, which will leave no doubt as to the nationality of the founders of the Scotie Benedictine congregation in Germany, and will at the same time settle the question as to the nationality of our three hermits, who, we are told, were fellow-countrymen of the monks at Ratisbon.

To begin with, the charter granted to the Scotie monks of Ratisbon by the Emperor Frederick II, in the year 1212, states that 'Scots only and none others dwelt in these monasteries.' This is further explained by the confirmatory charter of the Emperor Sigismund, where we read the following words: 'A humble petition on behalf of the Abbot, Prior, and community of *Scots and Irish from greater Scotland*,' etc. And Matthæus Raderus, in his work on the Saints of Bavaria, speaking of the hermit Murchertach (who was the first of the Irish pilgrims to settle at Ratisbon), says: 'Muricherodachus, an *Irishman from ancient Scotia*, preceded *his countryman Marianus*, and was the first of all those who came from that country to Ratisbon.' And of Marianus, the founder of the Scotie monastery at Ratisbon, he says: 'Marianus, therefore, was a *born Scot or Irishman*, for ancient Scotia is the same as Ireland . . . the other [Scotia] of which we do not speak here is a corner of Britain.'

From this we may gather that our three hermits were, like the founders of the famous Scotie Benedictine congregation of Germany, Scots or Irish from ancient Scotia or Ireland. It is very probable, at the same time, that these Irish monks were joined, later on, by numbers of their fellow-countrymen across the Channel, the Celtic Scots or Irish of North Britain, with whom, owing to their near relationship and close proximity, they had always been on the most intimate terms. This is rendered still more probable by the fact that about the time that the Irish monks were founding their congregation in Germany, momentous changes were taking place in the ancient Irish kingdom of Scotland, which would make it a less desirable place of residence for its Scoto-Irish inhabitants.

I allude to the rapid anglicization of the country, which began with the reign of Malcolm Canmore (1058-1093), who, himself only half a Celt, was married to the Saxon Queen Margaret, better known as St. Margaret. Malcolm had been brought up at the Court of Edward the Confessor, where he would probably have been imbued with Saxon and Norman



ideas. Moreover, it was during his reign that the Norman Conquest took place, which drove many Saxon refugees to the Court of Scotland, among them Edgar Atheling, whose sister Margaret became Malcolm's consort. During the brief reign of his brother and successor Donald Bane (1093-1097) a Celtic re-action took place, but the Saxon and Norman influence, which first began to make itself felt in the reigns of Malcolm and Margaret, made rapid headway under their three sons, Edgar, Alexander, and David, who successively ascended the throne of Scotland.

In the reign of Edgar (1097-1107) the seat of government was removed from Scone (the ancient Celtic capital) to Edinburgh—a Saxon city. His brother Alexander I (1107-1124) continued the process of anglicization. He founded a monastery for Canons of St. Augustine at Scone, while Fothad, the last Celtic Bishop of St. Andrews, was succeeded in turn by a monk of Durham and a monk of Canterbury. His protection was asked by Anselm of Canterbury for monks sent to Scotland at the request of his brother Edgar.

In the reign of his brother David I (1124-1153) the Celtic Culdees at St. Andrews and Dunkeld were ejected and bishoprics established in their places, while at Melrose and elsewhere Cistercian monks were introduced. It was in this reign that the feudal system took firm root in opposition to the Celtic clan system, at least in the still limited territory which submitted to the new Scottish dynasty. And thus, as the Irish monks had been obliged to retire from their foundations in the north of England—from Ripon and Lindisfarne and many other spots,—so now their monastic strongholds north of the Tweed were invaded. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that numbers of the Scoto-Irish of North Britain, both monks and laymen, should have preferred to quit the country, and we may reasonably suppose that many of them joined their Irish or Scotie brethren, who flocked to the Continent in such numbers in this and succeeding centuries.

Having premised this much, let us now hear Dom Anselm's account of the three Scoto-Irish hermits, after we have first given the reader a few biographical notes about this, the last, monk of the Scoto-Irish monastery of Ratisbon. Dom Anselm Robertson was born in Fochabers, Scotland, in 1824, was professed in the monastery of St. James, Ratisbon, in 1845, and was ordained priest in 1851.

When the Bavarian religious houses were suppressed by Napoleon in 1806, Ratisbon was allowed to linger on and die a natural death, no novice being allowed to be received. This, however, did not prevent the profession of Dom Anselm, but in 1850 the monastery was finally suppressed. As he was the only monk left he sought admission into the English congregation of St. Benedict's Order, and in 1878 was aggregated to the community of Fort Augustus, which had been founded by Lord Lovat in that year. Thither Dom Anselm brought with him some chalices and other belongings of Ratisbon, and eventually died in retirement at Fochabers. It is interesting to note that the late octogenarian Scottish baronet, Sir Everard Gordon, who gave the country house of Buckie in Banff to the Fort Augustus monks, was once a student or novice at Ratisbon.

Nobody will deny [says Dom Anselm Robertson] that Scotie <sup>1</sup> monks acquired, in times past, very great renown for holiness, and that they rendered illustrious by their sanctity the diocese of Ratisbon. This is acknowledged by all the hagiographers who have written the *Lives of Blessed Marinus*,<sup>2</sup> Abbot of St. Peter's [Ratisbon], and of Blessed Murecherodachi,<sup>3</sup> a hermit in the Upper Monastery, as we are informed by Matthæus Raderus in his *Bavaria Sancta*.

Wherefore, being inspired thereto by the spotless lives of these good monks, the most distinguished members of the first nobility in Ratisbon erected two monasteries, one being dedicated to St. Peter, chief of the Apostles, the other to the Apostle St. James the Greater, wherein Scotie monks for many years served God, in strict monastic discipline, according to the rule of St. Benedict.

Although the first mentioned monastery has been reduced to ashes, the second one, dedicated to St. James, is still, after many eventful changes, occupied to this day by Benedictine monks of the same nationality,<sup>4</sup> to the great edification of the neighbourhood. From out of it came the Blessed Marinus, or Martinus,<sup>5</sup> distinguished for the sanctity of his life and for his observance of the strict monastic discipline, on account of which he was made [Prior of the monastery, instead of the

<sup>1</sup> To avoid confusion, I have coined the word 'Scotie' to represent the Latin *Scoti*. To translate the latter by the word 'Irish' or 'Scottish' would be misleading. The expression 'Scotie' will include both the Scots of ancient Ireland and those of the Irish colony in North Britain.

<sup>2</sup> The writer means Marianus, the founder of the Scotie congregation.

<sup>3</sup> He was the first of the Irish to arrive at Ratisbon, and lived as a hermit in a dwelling placed at his disposal by the Abbess Willa of the Obermünster, i.e., Upper Convent.

<sup>4</sup> This reckless statement would not be unworthy of Dom Anselm's countryman, Dempster.

<sup>5</sup> The 't' in Martinus seems to have been aspirated in Irish, and consequently dropped in pronunciation and in spelling. The same fate has happened to the same letter in the name Patrick.



Blessed Macharius, who was appointed as first Abbot of Würzburg. For, about the year 1136, Blessed Macharius, the Prior of Ratisbon, was sent with twelve companions to Würzburg to occupy the monastery erected for the Scotie monks by Bishop Embricho, as Trithemius declares.

Now, it happened that while the Blessed Marinus was faithfully fulfilling his duties as Prior, two holy pilgrims of the Scotie race, having visited the shrines of the Holy Apostles, and other celebrated places of pilgrimage, arrived at Bavaria on their journey homewards. But while they were passing the night in a wood close to a certain unoccupied farm, at that time called Wide, not far from the river Altmil,<sup>1</sup> they were inspired by Heaven, during their sleep, to lead a solitary life in that spot, and consecrate the rest of their days to divine contemplation. So when they awoke and began to look about for a spot suitable for their retreat, they decided to settle down in that very solitude, especially when they learned that the place belonged to the Scotie monks of Ratisbon.

Accordingly they hasten to their fellow-countrymen at Ratisbon, by whom they were hospitably received, and from whom they easily obtained not only permission to settle down there, but also all the assistance necessary to enable them to lead the eremitical life. Moreover, Blessed Marinus, at that time Prior of the monastery, being greatly impressed by the holiness of our pilgrims, obtained his Abbot's permission to join them; and so the perfect number of three was made up, and there issued forth the triad of Scotie saints, afterwards renowned at Gristett, Marinus above-mentioned being the leader of the band."

Now, Blessed Zimius was already a professed monk and priest of the celebrated monastery of Dunfermline<sup>2</sup> of the Order of St. Benedict, in modern Scotland; and as he was about to make a pilgrimage to the shrines of the Apostles, he took along with him as his companion the Blessed Vimius (at that time a layman), of the noble house of the Vimii, and a true Benedictine monk by his holiness of life.

These three most holy men, one in heart and one in soul in their desire to serve God perfectly, entered upon the solitary life in the afore-

<sup>1</sup> The Altmühl, a tributary of the Danube.

<sup>2</sup> It is most improbable that Zimius and his companion came from Dunfermline, as that house had become a Benedictine foundation only a few years before—and is not likely to have begun already to send subjects abroad. In any case, its monks at this period were Saxons, not Scots. The church of Dunfermline was begun by Malcolm and Margaret towards the end of the eleventh century. The monastery, which was begun later, seems not to have been a Benedictine foundation at first. No mention whatever is made of the Order in Malcolm's charter, which may be seen in Dugdale, and it is remarkable that the chief witness, and the only ecclesiastical one, is 'Ivo, the Abbot of the Culdees'—'Testibus Ivo Kelledeorum abbate, Macduffe comite; Duncano comite, etc.'

The abbey seems to have been partially completed in the reign of Alexander I, but we do not find Benedictines associated with Dunfermline till 1124, the first year of the reign of his successor, David I, who brought a colony of thirteen Benedictine monks from Canterbury. Scottish monks from Dunfermline did come to Ratisbon, but it was some five hundred years later, when the Baillies, Stuarts, and Andersons, etc., entered into possession.

said place, the Abbot of Ratisbon being Dermittius<sup>1</sup> (second), whom Hundius wrongly calls Mauritius, and makes him the first abbot. For, about the year 1150,<sup>2</sup> a most holy man named Christianus was elected third abbot of the said monastery, and it was during his term of office that these three holy hermits were called to their heavenly reward. Their remains were placed in the parish church of Gristett, and the place was thenceforward called, from the hermits, 'Einsidl' in the vernacular, i.e., Hermitage. It is now a rural property inhabited by two farmers, and it belongs still to the above-mentioned monastery by prescriptive right, as is witnessed by the charter of the Emperor Frederick II, confirming the possessions of the monastery, which expressly names the place Einsidl, or Hermitage.

Our annals assign the year 1154 as the date of the erection of the church of Gristett, which the aforesaid Abbot Christian caused to be built in honour of St. Martin, Bishop, and he had the holy bodies of the three saints translated there, one after the other, for they did not pay the debt of nature in one and the same year. The *obit* of Blessed Marinus is assigned to the year 1153, and he was consequently buried in the little oratory of the hermitage until the church of Griestet was roofed in. I have found the following reasons for building the church mentioned in an ancient register: firstly, that the original burial-place in the hermitage was too narrow and inconvenient for the reception of the crowds who flocked every day to visit the sacred relics; and secondly it was desirable that the heavenly quiet and retirement of the two remaining companions should not suffer from such frequent visits of the faithful.

The deaths of Blessed Zimius and Vimius are assigned to the year 1150,<sup>3</sup> but the exact date<sup>4</sup> cannot be fixed on which Blessed Marinus or the other two saints ended their earthly course and entered upon their eternal reward. As, however, for many centuries past the faithful have been wont to flock to the holy tomb of the three saints, early in the month of November, we may fairly presume that it was about that time of the year that Blessed Marinus went to Heaven, especially as it was in honour of his relics that the church was built, and dedicated to the great St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, whose feast is celebrated on the 11th of that month. And, in fact, I have seen it stated in an ancient register that it was on the very feast of St. Martin that the body of Blessed Marinus was translated, with great solemnity, from the little chapel of the hermitage to the new church—it being the anniversary of his death. The record adds, moreover, that, 'from the very first day on which the church of Griestet was roofed in and the relics of Blessed Marinus translated thither, the daily concourse of the faithful was so great that even the church was not sufficiently large to receive the people coming from the neighbourhood.'

<sup>1</sup> Dermittius was the third abbot, according to Paritius, and ruled from 1121 to 1133.

<sup>2</sup> Christian was the fourth in order, and held office from 1133 till 1164 (Paritius). He died in the year 1172, in the twenty-third year of his office, according to the Bishop of Ratisbon (J. Weigl, vide *infra*). According to the catalogue of Paritius, Domninus, the fifth abbot, died in the same year, 1172.

<sup>3</sup> 1155 says the Franciscan brochure.

<sup>4</sup> i.e., the exact day of the month.



Our author then goes on to mention the manner in which they were buried, as described in the same register.

Blessed Marinus was buried before the high altar on the Gospel side ; BB. Zimius and Vimius on the Epistle side, at the steps of the choir, being placed next under each other, but in separate coffins. . . . The first two were buried in sacerdotal vestments and Benedictine habit—while B. Vimius, not being in orders, was buried in the habit of a Hermit of St. Benedict. Blessed Marinus spent thirteen years in all in the hermitage (1140-1153), the other two fifteen (1140-1155).

He then describes the situation of Griesstetten, and alludes to the solemn translation of the relics, made by order of the Ordinary of Ratisbon,<sup>1</sup> on the 12th day of June, 1689, when the holy bodies were transferred to a more suitable position behind the high altar.

The reader will find in the Bollandists, under date 12th June, a full account of this last translation, in a document drawn up by the Coadjutor-Bishop of Ratisbon, and transmitted by him to the Bollandists. This document is interesting, as it contains a brief notice of the history of the three hermits. The same Right Rev. Prelate also drew up a narrative of two miracles<sup>2</sup> worked through the intercession of our saints, not long after the solemn translation. He also drew up a prayer and antiphon in their honour. Both these documents he transmitted likewise to the Bollandists, where they may be seen, so that it is not necessary to give them here.

The third document dealing with our saints, to which I have alluded in the beginning of this article, consists of an instant supplication to the Holy See, by the Bishop of Ratisbon, for advice as to what attitude he should observe with regard to the cultus of the three hermits. It was drawn up at Ratisbon in the year 1848, and may be summarized as follows :—

He begins by remarking that the veneration and cultus of the three Scotie saints (whom the people call *die elenden* <sup>3</sup> *drei Heiligen*, i.e., the three foreign saints) increases among the faithful daily, and that he has seen two books compiled

<sup>1</sup> Albert Ernest, Count of Wartenberg, and Administrator of the bishopric of Ratisbon. Dom Placid Fleming, Abbot of Ratisbon from 1672 to 1720, assisted the Bishop in translation.—German brochure.

<sup>2</sup> One of which was the cure of Violenta, the daughter-in-law of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and sister of the Elector of Bavaria, who was suffering from an ulcer in the cheek and was pronounced incurable. This event was made the subject of a fresco in the church at Griesstetten.—German brochure.

<sup>3</sup> 'Elend' (from 'ausland'), an old German word='outland,' foreign. In modern German the word means 'miserable.'

in German containing narratives of the miracles worked by the intercession of these saints. He has accordingly been asked by the priest and people of Griesstetten to approve of their placing the bodies in costly shrines under separate altars for the veneration of the faithful—a pious couple having volunteered to pay all the expenses. To this pious request he was about to accede, had not his attention been drawn to the decree of Urban VIII, 1634, forbidding the public veneration of saints not canonized by the Holy See, unless such cultus had been practised already before the year 1534. He was consequently advised to consult the Apostolic See, especially as the people desire to have Masses said in honour of these saints, as has been done from time immemorial, if we are to trust the books containing their miracles, but no authentic documents exist concerning their cultus before 1534.

While awaiting the decision of Rome he begs to add the following remarks to what the Bollandists have published. It is not surprising that these saints should have escaped the notice of Matthæus Raderus, as he would not be likely to suspect that an out-of-the-way hamlet in Bavaria, not even marked on the map, should possess such a great treasure. Moreover, the disorders consequent on the so-called Reformation are largely responsible for the oblivion into which their memory had fallen. Not to mention the Bohemian disturbances and the Thirty Years' War, the town of Ratisbon was occupied by the Swedes in 1635, when priests and religious were obliged to fly for their lives, while the Lutherans ruthlessly destroyed all the most valuable books and documents in the archives, especially those dealing with lives of the saints. In Bavaria alone 3,000 villages are said to have been devastated by the Swedes, and Griesstetten did not escape their ravages.

The Bishop then gives, from the archives of the Scotie monastery of St. James and of the city of Ratisbon, a résumé of the history of Marianus, and of the foundation of the monastery at Ratisbon and of the hermitage of Griesstetten. It does not add many new details to what we already know, but differs in a few particulars. He begins by stating that Marianus, with some of his countrymen, came to Ratisbon in the year 1064,<sup>1</sup> during the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hogan (I. E. RECORD, November, 1894) states that he left Ireland in 1067, agreeing with the Bollandists, who make him arrive in Germany in the same year.



pontificate of Alexander II. He was at first supported by the bounty of the abbesses of the Upper and Lower monasteries, and later occupied a little monastery, which a certain Sebastian Beer erected for him near the chapel of St. Peter outside the walls. But as Marianus and his companions rendered great educational services, especially by learnedly expounding the Holy Scriptures for the benefit of young clerics, and as his community was increased by new arrivals from Scotia, some of the first citizens of Ratisbon erected<sup>1</sup> the large monastery of St. James of the Scots, together with its celebrated church, which was dedicated by Hartwic,<sup>2</sup> Bishop of Ratisbon.

Among the principal benefactors was Otto von Richtenburg, Burgrave of Ratisbon, who endowed the monastery richly with money and lands, including the property of Grienstett,<sup>3</sup> where the hermits settled down. This probably took place under the first abbot, Domnellus,<sup>4</sup> who is stated in the necrology of the monastery to have died in the year 1121. The year of their death cannot be fixed with certainty, but their translation to the chapel in Griesstetten was carried out by Christian, the third abbot, who died in 1172, having ruled as abbot for twenty-three years.<sup>5</sup>

Bishop Weigl concludes by giving a sketch of the modern history of Griesstetten, which may have interest for some readers. Its church and presbytery were all but burned to the ground by the Swedes in the year 1633, the parish priest being obliged to flee for his life. It was, as far as possible, restored by Placid Fleming,<sup>6</sup> who was elected Abbot in 1672, and received the abbatial blessing in 1692,

<sup>1</sup> In the year 1090 according to Dr. Hogan; in the beginning of the twelfth century according to our authority.

<sup>2</sup> In 1120 (Bollandists). Hartwicus was made Bishop of Ratisbon 1105; died 1126 (Bollandists). According to Weigl, he ruled the diocese from 1105 to 1122.

<sup>3</sup> *Alias* Griesstetten. In the charter of confirmation granted to the monastery by the Emperor Frederick II, in 1212, we find mentioned 'griestett cum capella, silvis, piscaturis, molendinis, Ansiedl, Dietfurt, etc.' (See charter, in I. E. RECORD, November, 1894.)

<sup>4</sup> This abbot is probably identical with Dominicus, a disciple of Marianus (first abbot), and his successor in the abbacy, who ruled from 1098 till 1121, according to Paritius.

<sup>5</sup> But see note, *supra*.

<sup>6</sup> He was one of the Scotch abbots. In 1515, Abbot Walker Arnowt (non-Scotus) was deposed (*Studien und Mittheilungen*), and a Scotchman, John Thomson, taking advantage of the similarity between the names Scoti and Scotch, persuaded the Pope (Leo IV) to make over to his countrymen the monastery of Ratisbon—the inheritance of the ancient Scoti or Irish. It was he who introduced Scottish monks from Dunfermline.

from the Coadjutor of Ratisbon [the same who carried out the translation of the relics in 1689].

From 1651 to 1714 the parish was administered by the parish priests of Mulbach, Dietfurt, or Zell, as the case might be. In the year 1714 Abbot Placid Fleming exercised jurisdiction there through his vicar, Father Maurus Stuart, and established a small seminary for Scotch youths, which was placed under the direction of Father Bernard Baillie. It was afterwards removed to Ratisbon.

The church which at present exists at Griesstetten is circular in form, and adorned with frescoes. It was built, or rather transformed, by the aforesaid Bernard Baillie (at that time abbot) and his successor Bernard Stuart, and consecrated by Bishop Schwabl in 1836. At the present day the parish is administered by the Franciscans of Dietfurt, in the name of the parish priest of Altmühlmünster, to whom the ordinary jurisdiction has been assigned since 1806.

PATRICK NOLAN, O.S.B.



# X-RAYS : THEIR SILVER JUBILEE

BY REV. H. V. GILL, S.J., M.A., M.Sc.

IN November, 1895, the discovery of X-rays was communicated to the Medical Society of Würzburg. There is no exaggeration in the assertion that the discovery of Röntgen's X-rays constitutes one of the most important landmarks in the domain of science. Both on account of its practical applications and its theoretical consequences the discovery has played a very important part in the scientific development of the last twenty-five years. Surgery, medicine, physics, chemistry, engineering have all been profoundly influenced by this powerful auxiliary. The story of the discovery is, besides, one of exceptional interest.

In order to appreciate the circumstances which led to the discovery we must go back another fifteen years. In 1880 Crookes published a fascinating account of experiments made by him on the electric discharge through gases at exceedingly low pressures. For many years physicists had been studying the discharge through tubes containing rarefied air and other gases, but Crookes was the first to study systematically the phenomena accompanying the discharge through gases at such low pressures. We need not dwell on the former series of experiments, which are also of great importance. It is enough to point out that in Crookes' experiments the 'negative discharge' is of capital importance. The characteristic of the rays which come from the negative pole, and are therefore called 'Cathode rays,' is that they shoot straight out from the cathode and are not influenced by the position of the positive terminal in the tube. Crookes' experiments were concerned with the properties of these rays.

Many will recall the beautiful effects which were shown in 'Natural Philosophy' courses in the old days before the present manner of conducting 'science' classes killed all interest in science amongst the younger members of the community. Crookes claimed to have discovered a fourth

state of matter which, adopting a phrase of Faraday, he called 'Radiant Matter.' The most striking property of the cathode rays was that of causing certain substances to glow brightly with a beautiful 'phosphorescent' light. The path of the beam could be mapped out by placing a card covered with a suitable substance inside the tube. Different materials glowed with different colours according to their constitution. Almost every substance glows to some extent when the cathode rays fall on it. Glass generally shows a bright apple-green colour, though a red glow is characteristic of certain kinds of glass.

When a magnet is brought near the tube the bright spots on the card or on the walls of the tube move to one side or the other according to the sign of the pole. Thus the path of the rays is influenced by a magnetic field. We need not here deal with the long discussion which lasted many years as to the nature of the cathode rays. The German scientists held strongly that they were ether waves. Almost all others held equally strongly that they were small charged particles moving with great velocity. 'Peace hath her victories,' and finally the latter view was proved to be correct and is not any longer questioned. The cathode rays are, in fact, a torrent of negative 'electrons' or 'corpuscles,' which were first recognized by Sir J. J. Thomson, and which are nearly 2,000 times smaller in mass than the atom of hydrogen, long believed to be the smallest portion of matter. During the fifteen years preceding the discovery of X-rays the subject was looked on as one of great scientific interest, but of no practical utility, except, perhaps, as an attractive subject for a popular lecture. As a matter of fact, during these fifteen years whenever an electric discharge passed through a 'Crookes tube,' X-rays were being produced!

The facts of the discovery were made public in the account of an interview with Röntgen shortly after the discovery. According to Röntgen's own account, he was trying whether 'invisible rays' came from a Crookes-, or, as the Germans say, a Hittorf-tube. He had covered up the tube with black paper, so that no light could issue from it. Lying on the table at a distance of a few yards was a card covered with crystals of barium platino-cyanide. This substance shines brightly when placed in the invisible or ultra-violet part of the spectrum. He excited the tube which was connected to an induction coil, in order to see if any



light came out. He found the tube to be completely enclosed, but to his great surprise he noticed that the screen on the table shone brightly whenever the discharge passed. He at once began to investigate the cause of this. He had discovered a new kind of radiation, which he called X-rays! They are, however, frequently, and more correctly, referred to as Röntgen-rays.

As soon as the discovery was published, every physicist got down from his shelves the old Crookes tubes and began to repeat Röntgen's experiment. The present writer was in Louvain at the time and remembers well assisting at the taking of a 'radiograph' by means of a tube which had been presented to the Professor of Physics some years previously by Crookes himself. The important lesson to be learned from this history is that this important discovery was the direct outcome of purely scientific investigations which had been carried out many years before there was any thought of a practical application. Röntgen himself was at the time engaged in a continuation of the investigation into the properties of the vacuum tube discharge, and was no doubt perfectly innocent of any expectation of discovering a fact which was destined to be of great commercial value. Without the scientific and theoretical work the practical applications could never have been made.

The discovery gave an immense impetus to physical research work, and those who were fortunate enough to be then occupied in such studies had an enormous field of investigation thrown open to them. The following ten years are amongst the most fruitful in the history of physical science. This was the direct result of the discovery. The fact that the X-rays could affect a photographic plate in the same way as light rays naturally suggested an application to surgery. The process of radiography depends on the fact that all substances are not equally transparent to Röntgen rays. In general the greater the atomic weight of a substance, the greater is its opacity. Lead is far less transparent than aluminium. The bones are less transparent than the skin and flesh; if the hand be placed between the source of radiation and the photographic plate, the result will be an outline of the bones, clearly distinguishable from the lighter shadow of the hand. All the development in the photographic application of X-rays has aimed at producing as great contrast as possible between the different regions of the body, combined with as short an

exposure as possible. So great is the perfection of apparatus and method which has been reached that it is now possible to obtain instantaneous radiographs of the different portions of the human body. The motions of food through the system can be followed and photographed by the simple expedient of mixing a quantity of bismuth with the food, which, owing to its higher atomic weight, is less transparent than the bones or flesh of the body.

The examination of the interior organs and of the bones can be conducted by the aid of a large screen covered with barium platino-cyanide or other suitable substance. The shadow of the more opaque parts is clearly seen, and, needless to say, such examinations are of the greatest value in surgery, and are, in fact, now part of the ordinary routine work. The development in this one branch alone has brought relief to innumerable sufferers both in times of peace and war. Incidentally it has meant the establishment of a great industry which affords employment to many workers. However, the use of X-rays as an instrument of diagnosis is not without its dangers:

It was soon found that undue and prolonged exposure to X-rays gave rise to a severe and painful form of skin disease, which once contracted cannot be cured. Like all good things, X-rays must be used in moderation. At the present time means have been devised to prevent these accidents, and with ordinary care there need be no danger whatever to either patient or doctor. In the earlier stages of the study of the subject several of the pioneers in this work lost their lives through this cause. All sorts of protective devices have been devised which need not here be described. But happily, under proper control, X-rays have become a powerful curative agency. Their application relieves many forms of skin disease, and cures certain kinds of rodent ulcers. So far X-rays do not seem to have provided a means of curing malignant tumours or deep-seated cancer. Ringworm is cured by them, though an over-exposure may mean the loss of the hair. For medical treatment it is necessary to make use of 'soft' rays. Soft rays are those which have small penetrating power, and are obtained by making use of a tube in which the vacuum is not too great. 'Hard' rays, on the other hand, which have great penetrating power, and which are produced by tubes in which the vacuum is very great, are required for photographic purposes.



The advance in our knowledge of X-rays went along two parallel lines. One consisted in the perfecting of the various applications which were discovered. The other concerned itself with the purely scientific aspect of the phenomena, and this has, if possible, been of even greater importance than the practical development. The first point which the scientists tried to discover was the precise nature of the X-rays. A long discussion ensued during which every possible explanation was at one stage suggested. We need not go into this discussion. The present view, almost unanimous amongst physicists, is that the X-rays are a form of ether wave motion, not essentially different from light waves. This view was originally based on the suggestion by Stokes that when a charged particle is suddenly stopped it sends out ether waves. The case may be illustrated by a stream of little pebbles falling into water. At the point of contact a series of waves will start and spread out over the surface. It is now quite certain that the cathode rays are composed of negatively charged electrons travelling with a great velocity. It is also known that the X-rays come from the spot struck by the cathode rays. These, in addition to other considerations, allow no reasonable doubt that the theory now held is correct.

In the form of Crookes' tube, by means of which Röntgen made the discovery, the cathode rays fell on the glass end opposite the cathode. The X-rays first discovered were those which came from the portion of the tube bombarded by the cathode rays. It was soon found that this method was very imperfect. In the first place the large area of the source was the cause of great indistinctness in the shadow thrown on the photographic plate or on the fluorescent screen. The use of a concave cathode 'focussed' the rays to a small area. At the focus was placed an 'anticathode' made of metal, from which the X-rays proceeded. This anticathode is not necessarily the anode, but is generally connected metallicly with it. Tubes suitable for producing hard or soft rays were obtained by regulating the pressure of the residual air in the bulb. Many hundred different kinds of X-ray tubes have been designed, but all are developments of the 'focus' tube, with an anticathode inclined at a suitable angle to the stream of cathode rays, so as to 'reflect' the beam of X-rays out through the side of the tube. The most modern form of tube is named after its inventor, Coolidge, and has several important advantages.

The cathode is composed of a spiral of tungsten. This spiral can be heated to a high temperature by means of a few storage cells. The intensity of the cathode rays depends on the temperature of the spiral, which can be regulated with great ease and exactness. The penetrating power of the rays depends on the potential difference between the electrodes. The exhaustion of these tubes is carried to a far greater degree than in the ordinary tubes. The anticathode is composed of a heavy mass of tungsten, which metal can best resist the heat. By means of such a tube conditions can be exactly reproduced and continuous observations be carried on without fear of changes in the properties of the tube, which so often happens in the case of the ordinary tubes. One of the peculiarities of this tube is that the glass does not show fluorescence.

The first discovery of purely scientific interest was that under a beam of X-rays a gas becomes a conductor of electricity. If two charged plates are parallel and a few centimetres distant from each other, it is found that no current passes when they are connected through a galvanometer. In its ordinary state air is a bad conductor of electricity. If, however, a beam of X-rays is allowed to pass between the plates it is found that a current passes. This is due to the fact that the X-rays 'ionize' the gas between the plates. This was a discovery of the very greatest importance in connexion with researches which finally established the existence of the electron. The ionisation of a gas implies the presence throughout the volume of the gas of a number of charged particles called 'ions.' In the case of ionization by X-rays this action consists in the detachment of electrons from the atoms of the gas. The application of X-rays to work on the determination of the mass and charge carried by electrons has been of the first importance.

Although X-rays are not reflected like light from ordinary polished surfaces, they are nevertheless reflected from crystalline faces. The cleavage planes of crystals mark the surfaces of layers of atoms arranged in a very regular manner. In 1912 Laue pointed out that the wave length of the X-rays was less than the distance between the atoms of the crystal, and suggested that the regular arrangement of the elements of a crystal might take the place of the ruled lines on diffraction grating. It was found to be so. A beam of X-rays is allowed to fall on a crystalline plate,



behind which, at a suitable distance, there is a photographic plate. It is found that the central patch caused by the narrow beam of X-rays is surrounded by a series of smaller patches arranged in regular patterns. The nature of these patterns enables us to calculate the arrangement of the molecules in the crystal, and has opened up a great field of research in the subject of crystallography. We know how the atoms are arranged in a crystal, and the discovery will be a means of throwing further light on the constitution of the atom itself.

In mica there are a series of parallel layers of atoms, and it is found that the way in which X-rays can be reflected from such a plate is analogous to the reflection of white light from a glass surface. The reflection can be detected either by photographic or ionization methods. For this purpose soft rays are required. It happens that the reflected ray is often harder, or more penetrating, than the incident ray. Although the law of reflection is not so clearly marked as in the case of light, it is found that the position of maximum intensity of the reflected X-ray corresponds exactly to the angle of optical reflection.

The anticathode, from which the X-rays proceed, is of great importance. As it often reaches a high temperature it must have a high melting point, and must possess other properties which we cannot describe here. Platinum has been used almost universally, but its price has now risen so high that other metals have been made use of. Amongst the best is tungsten, which has a melting point of  $3,200^{\circ}\text{C}$ . As a result of investigations on the nature of the anticathode, it has been found that different metals give out 'characteristic' X-rays which depend on the atomic weights of the metals. The characteristic rays differ from each other in their penetrating powers. Many substances give out two kinds of characteristic rays, one called the K series and the other the L series ; in such cases the former is about three hundred times more penetrating than the latter. Both series become more penetrating as the atomic weight of the element increases.

The study of these characteristic rays has been of the greatest importance in the study of the nature of the atom. A scientist named Moseley, who was killed during the war, at Suvla Bay, had made discoveries of greatest interest and importance in this branch of physics. As a result of the experiments on reflection from crystalline planes which

have been referred to, it is definitely determined that X-rays are ether waves of extremely short wave-length. According to Moseley's results there is a definite relation between the wave-length of the characteristic rays from a source of any substance and its place in the periodic series or table of elements which has been for many years accepted by chemists. Some of the irregularities in that table have been explained and set right by the application of Moseley's X-ray work. Both the chemist and the physicist can now assert with certainty that there are ninety-two chemical elements, and that of these all but five are known. The properties of the missing members can be definitely stated. Other deductions of importance, which are as yet hardly understood, are being worked out at present.

The other benefits which the discovery of X-rays has conferred on science would lead us too far afield. There is no doubt that the discovery of radium and radioactivity was due to the logical consequences and research work suggested by the properties of X-rays. An example of a very practical application of the use of X-rays in commercial life is the examination of materials. Manufactured goods of metal and other materials can be subjected to a searching examination, by means of which flaws, which would otherwise be quite incapable of detection without cutting up the object, can be at once discovered. False gems may also be distinguished from the genuine articles in the same way.

The progress in our knowledge in this department of science, which is being added to continually, gives every reason for the belief that still further benefits, both practical and theoretical, will result from the discovery made twenty-five years ago:

H. V. GILL, S.J.



## MENTAL RESTRICTION AND EQUIVOCATION

BY REV. J. BRODIE BROSAN, M.A.

IN the October number, 1914, of the I. E. RECORD the 'Malice of Lying' was discussed. Soon after a learned theological Professor wrote privately, expressing the wish that the kindred question of 'Mental Restriction' might at some future date receive due treatment. It had been incidentally touched upon in the October article, and left the reader in a state of misapprehension and doubt. To remove these and satisfy the kind wish then expressed, the present attempt is made. One feels somewhat nervous of the task, for to many, capable of judging, up to the present the subject has not been adequately nor convincingly treated. This is little reassuring. Therefore one can only state clearly the opinion a detailed study of the matter has evoked, hoping thereby some light may be shed on a question at once practical and yet replete with much difficulty and misapprehension.

For an historical résumé of 'Mental Restriction,' the excellent article under that name may be read in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. Perhaps Raymond of Pennafort (1235) suggested the theory. Certain murderers, seeking with intent to kill, ask one who has seen their victim enter a certain house if the pursued entered. St. Raymond says that in his opinion the interrogated may, if considered effective, give no reply; else employ equivocation, or if conscience allow answer, 'He is not there.' Clearly this last suggests the mental restriction: he is not there 'for you' or that 'I may legitimately tell you,' etc.<sup>1</sup> Though St. Raymond equivocated on the word 'est'—'He eats not here.' Of course Equivocation and Restriction existed before St. Raymond's time.

<sup>1</sup> Vide *Theol. Christ. Dog. Moral.* t. N. in Decal.

In the sixteenth century Martin Alpizcueta's solution to a marriage case sent to him by the Jesuits of Valladolid was destined to develop this subject. The case is well known; yet its brief statement may be pardonable. A certain man enters into a private marriage with a lady, without notifying her of the fact that he has no intention of marriage. He pronounces the words 'I take thee for my wife.' Later, when questioned, he denies that he ever said the words (mentally adding 'in the sense now attached to them') and even swears to this. Such is the case. Navarre's solution lays down, granted a good reason, that this man is guilty of (a) no lie; (b) no perjury; (c) no sin. Others after the Doctor Navarrus gave much attention to this question. The peculiar phase known as 'purely mental restriction' Father Jones<sup>1</sup> thinks was 'first formally asserted by the Jesuit Navarre'; it is said to have been introduced to the notice of Theologians by Sanchez, who, however, declares it suspected. It seems to have been approved of by a few of the Summists in the seventeenth century. It was rejected by Innocent XI, who condemned among others the following proposition:—

Si quis vel solus, vel coram aliis, sive interrogatus sive propria sponte sive recreationis causa sive quocumque alio fine juret se non fecisse aliquid quod revera fecit; intelligendo intra se aliquid aliud quod non fecit: vel aliam viam ab ea in qua fuit, vel quodvis aliud verum, revera non mentitur, nec est perjurus.—(Cond. P. No. 26.)

This put an end to the teaching that restrictions purely mental could at times be lawful. As a lie is a 'locutio contra mentem'<sup>2</sup> and intrinsically wrong, because therein the intellect 'acts contrary to its natural purpose,' and 'deliberately utilizes the power of speech in a manner that is quite a specific contradiction of its functions as intended by our Maker,'<sup>3</sup> the present contention maintains that mental restriction 'late sumpta' is not a lie nor intrinsically wrong. Hence 'positis ponendis' it is both good and lawful. Further, as mental restriction and equivocation seem based on the same fundamental principle, though *in se* there is quite a difference between them, they are here treated under the same head. Doubtless both owe their origin to the fact that, at times, they are the only effective

<sup>1</sup> *Equivocation*, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> See article I. E. RECORD, December, 1910.

<sup>3</sup> 'Malice of Lying,' article I. E. RECORD, October, 1914.



means of guarding truth which it is a strict duty or legitimate right to conceal.

Mental restriction is either 'pure mentalis' or 'non pure mentalis.' The former is, unfortunately, not infrequently loosely defined; often inadequately if not incorrectly. Such definitions might be profitably discussed. It were too long however.

Let us follow St. Alphonsus: 'Restrictio autem, mentalis alia est pure mentalis quae modo nullo ab aliis percipi potest: alia est non pure mentalis, quae ex adjunctis circumstantiis innotescere potest.'<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it were clearer to say 'Restrictio pure mentalis' is the use of a 'locutio,' which, in the circumstances, can reasonably have but one definite meaning and that 'contra mentem loquentis,' though mentally the 'loquens' attaches a meaning to it which it cannot convey. A moment's reflection must convince the speaker, as it does anyone who thinks, that such procedure is tantamount to a lie. It is therefore intrinsically wrong and never lawful. Hence the condemned propositions already quoted. 'Restrictio non pure mentalis' is the use of a 'locutio' which has two or more reasonable meanings, either because it may be taken in more than one context, or has more than one legitimate signification in itself or in context, but yet the speaker lawfully restricts it to one meaning and to one context and therein truthfully expresses his mind. This meaning and this context, in the circumstances, are, so to speak, reasonably within the competence of the 'locutio.' Thus this meaning, 'potest innotescere aliis' and 'per consequens, ex adjunctis,' also the 'mentalis restrictio.' Take the example of a prisoner, who, though personally guilty, yet pleads 'not guilty.' His reply may be taken either in the 'context' of legal guilt or conscientious guilt. We take it the case is not proven. The prisoner here restricts his reply to the context of legal guilt and undoubtedly speaks the truth. He is not legally guilty until the charge is proven. If, however, the prisoner wishes to convey that he is not guilty in conscience (we take it that he is) then this restriction of his answer makes it a 'locutio contra mentem' and it is undoubtedly a lie. Further, if he has been proved legally guilty, and makes the same reply, wishing mentally to convey that 'he did not murder Abel,' this is an idea the 'locutio' could never reasonably disclose. This he must

<sup>1</sup> *Moral Theology*, Lib. 3, Tract ii.

understand. His 'restrictio' is therefore 'pure mentalis' and is nothing more nor less than a deliberate lie. Note with reference to restrictions: (a) St. Alphonsus uses the words 'potest percipi, innotescere,' i.e., can be known—it does not follow that his hearers will actually know it; (b) it is the peculiar sense or restriction the speaker legitimately wishes the 'locutio' to convey that can be discovered, it does not follow that this is the peculiar sense or context in which the questioner put his question. The respondent, of course, requires a sufficient reason for so answering. Thus, 'positis ponendis,' the reply is given in the context or sense in which the questioner may reasonably expect an answer, for St. Alphonsus says: 'Non tenemur ad mentem aliorum loqui, si justa causa subsit.'<sup>1</sup> For if we were bound always to answer the unreasonable question of another, in the sense wherein his question is put, how could we ever withhold a secret, or information we are bound to conceal, or might legitimately refuse? Our answer, though not given in his sense or context, is yet given, if indeed any reply is vouchsafed—in a context any sane man would recognize as reasonable, and therein it is true.

From what has been said it ought to be clear: (a) that a mental restriction is not a 'falsiloquium.' Hence the theory of those who say 'Falsiloquium (i.e., mentalem restrictionem late sumptam) se enuntiationem alicujus falsi, quando veritas proximo non debetur, esse illicitum extra casum necessitatis sed licere in casu necessitatis' is misleading, incorrect and without foundation.<sup>2</sup> (b) In 'Restrictio pure mentalis' the 'locutio' must in the circumstances express an opinion contra 'mentem loquentis.' This clearly differentiates it from 'Restrictio late mentalis.' Whatever may be said about difficult practical cases, in theory there does not seem to be much force in Noldin's opinion 'Difficultas est in discernenda restrictione pure et late mentali.'<sup>3</sup> (c) Mental restriction 'non pure sumpta' (this kind alone is spoken of as 'mental restriction' to the end of this paper, unless the contrary is specified) can never obtain when competent authority or the nature and circumstances of the case legitimately and reasonably confine an answer to one meaning and one context. 'Reus tamen vel testis qui legitime a iudice interrogetur, nequit

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 451.

<sup>2</sup> Tanqueray, *Synopsis Theol. Moralis et Pastoralis*, n. 418.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. ii. n. 630.



ulla equivocatione uti et idem dicendum est in contractibus onerosis quia alias injuria alteri irrogaretur.'<sup>1</sup> Neither may a person, priest or otherwise, make a profession of faith (nor a 'fortiori' swear thereto) in articles of belief, attaching to them mentally a meaning other or contradictory to that which legitimate authority has laid down. If he does so, no amount of casuistry<sup>2</sup> can exempt him from a deliberate lie (or perjury). Without drawing further conclusions from the definitions above explained, we may conclude our remarks by saying that it seems to us many of the difficulties against mental restrictions arise from the fact that it is applied to cases where it does not obtain, and is said to exist in others where it has no existence.

Every 'locutio' must be interpreted in its reasonable context. This must be determined by the subject in hand—the rights or lawful liberty of the interlocutor to obtain information and the legitimate liberty of the respondent to grant or withhold the same. Herein the theory of Grotius has some force. True, generally we may not speak so that our 'effatum' is in 'conflict with the natural right and good of others.'<sup>3</sup> Yet surely the theory is one-sided. May not the speaker's rights annul those of others? All will admit that at least it is unreasonable to ask or induce another to commit sin. Thus the rights (or legitimate liberty) of the speaker require consideration equally with the rights (or legitimate freedom) of others. Clearly questions and the answers to the same must be interpreted in a context that will exonerate the respondent from moral guilt, from unreasonable disloyalty to his country, to his cause, etc. This far-reaching principle must be borne in mind when answers are interpreted—except indeed it is evident that the respondent has no sense of morality nor of honour. The question of rights in this subject mostly centres on rights with reference to secrets. Some secrets are, by Divine Law, never to be divulged save where the Law itself allows their manifestation.

This is the case of knowledge received as part of Sacramental Confession. No power on earth has a right to extract such secrets, and the rights of any Government or of men to gain information are herein nullified by Divine Law. Only the free and willingly expressed consent of the

<sup>1</sup> St. Alphonsus, n. 454.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Jones, *Equivocation on practice of Anglican Clergymen*, p. 164 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> *De jure belli et pacis*, bk. iii. p. 10 et seq.

penitent who has confessed can herein give power to reveal such knowledge and that not always. For if the revelation by the priest, in such circumstances, would bring contempt and derision on the Sacrament, and thereby keep others away from its reception, the revelation above mentioned would carry with it a violation of Divine Law, and we think, this granted, neither could the penitent allow the revelation, nor the priest avail of it, if so allowed. In such cases there is no power on earth could reasonably demand this information nor could any priest ever lawfully give it. His answers to the questions herein, it is clear, could not be understood as obtaining in this context.

Other secrets vary in importance and in binding force; yet as secrets 'qua tales' are not here the subject of discussion, those who wish to know the obligations they impose must be referred to the special treatise hereon in Moral Theology. As regards 'professional confidence,' it may be interesting to note the English Law, according to Father Jones,<sup>1</sup> recognizes privilege only with reference to secrets entrusted to the legal profession, but to no other. In Ireland, he tells us, 'by common practice, secrets of counsel confided to priests are privileged in Courts of Justice.'<sup>2</sup> Whatever may be said of English Law—to us sometimes it is deplorable and requires amendment—it is quite certain its rights are in some cases annulled by higher rights or by Divine Law, and where this occurs the respondents may use mental restriction or refuse disclosure of evidence in any other legitimate manner. For revelation herein is often a sin for the respondent, and no power on earth can authorize anybody to commit sin nor can it force knowledge beyond its just claims.

This leads us to the next consideration. Doubtless it is the duty of Theologians to explain the offices and duties of various classes of persons engaged in legal procedure. They usually set forth first the Common Law, then the special laws or customs of their own country. This has led some,<sup>3</sup> not sufficiently acquainted with Theology, to take legal decisions for the verdict of ethics. True, they often modify each other, but one is not the other, nor must a mere legal decision be considered the decision of Moral Theology. St. Alphonsus has adapted this method. Through ignorance thereof, his Moral Theology has been

<sup>1</sup> Jeb., p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Dr. Liddesdale's attack on St. Alphonsus, letter *Pall Mall Gazette*, 22nd November, 1887.



at times grossly misstated and much misunderstood. Take the following passage dealing with human law : ' Item, si testis, ex alio capite non teneatur deponere (interrogatus potest nescire crimen quod revera scit—in two legal cases) nempe si ipsi constet crimen caruisse culpa, vel si sciat sed sub secreto cum nulla praeceperit infamia.' Here St. Alphonsus says, if it is evident to the witness that the crime was without fault, or if he knows it, but only ' sub secreto cum nulla praeceperit infamia,' the law does not, in the case in hand, consider this evidence of the crime, and so the law exempts him from giving it. If, however, in either of the above the judge—who then, by the way, was the questioner—summoned such witness as described before him, the person so summoned might use the context of the law now dealt with and swear truthfully within that context (by a mental restriction) that he did not know the accused committed the crime; that is to say, that he had no knowledge available as legal evidence.

Let us take a case in English Law. Suppose a person knows with absolute certainty, but with a knowledge that is not legal evidence, that a certain murderer is guilty. Can such person, if summoned as a witness, swear that he has no evidence to give (meaning, of course, legal evidence) or that he does not know legally that the crime was committed? If he does so, is he a liar or a perjurer? Does he not express the exact truth when the 'context' or question is of legal evidence? If he swears that the murderer is legally guilty on his illegal evidence when he knows he is not—can he be exempted from lying and perjury? St. Alphonsus says in a similar case he ought to swear, as witness, that he does not know the accused is guilty. Surely the Saint is right? His decision is on the broad principle that the oath binds only within the understood and express convention between him who swears and him who receives the oath, that is, within the limits imposed by the law. Now hear what Dr. Liddesdale has to say on this. St. Alphonsus, we are told, lays down

that a witness or an accused, if irregularly questioned by a judge in court, may swear that he is ignorant of the crime to which he in fact is privy, meaning thereby that he does not know it so as to be legally bound to depose it, and if the act be one which the witness does not himself consider a crime (for example, agrarian murder in Ireland) he is not bound to disclose it.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Letter, *Pall Mall Gazette*.

Could anything be more grossly misstated or more terribly misunderstood, not to mention the bad translation of the text? The particular case, seeking evidence where the law declares there is none (the case made by St. Alphonsus), is here generalized to meet any questioning of a judge; the particular and lawful restriction of witness in the Saint's case is here generalized and suggested as a lawful procedure in any case whatsoever; and the whole is given to the world as a specimen of a general ethical conclusion and of the moral teaching of the Catholic Church! Could anything be more deplorable or unfair?

The principles set forth in this discussion might be elucidated by a series of examples, were not this paper already sufficiently long. We may perhaps venture a few remarks on the marriage difficulty solved by Navarre. Unfortunately we have not the original nor the details before us. First, what is the context of the case? It is a private contract—matrimony. The 'locutio' is an expression in words of that contract—at least seemingly. The man's contention is that he uttered the 'locutio' without any intention of marriage. Let us first examine the context. Either the conditions of the case were such that one must (a) reasonably consider that a real contract was intended, or (b) they were not. If (a), then clearly the 'locutio' could only have one rational meaning and was incapable of any other, no mental restriction, no matter how potent, could endow it with any other signification than that of perfecting the contract. A moment's reflection could have shown this. To utter it therefore, without intending marriage, was to be guilty of restriction 'pure mentalis,' or, in other words, of a deliberate lie. Thus the man's later deposition, that he did not say the words (mentally adding, 'in the sense now attached to them'), was also a deliberate lie—for he must have known that in the circumstances his 'locutio' could have no other reasonable meaning than that which the context imperatively imposed upon it, and that no unexpressed wish could possibly alter this fact. Thus, when he wilfully pronounced the 'locutio,' his mental restriction became a mere velleity, and his practical will was that the 'locutio' bore the only signification that it could bear. This will must have prevailed. Thus, he was guilty of (1) a lie, (2) perjury, and (3) a very serious sin. If (b), then the context could not reasonably be considered that of a real contract—marriage, this the lady, if she used her common



sense, must have known. The man's 'locutio' was not then confined to one meaning, and for a sufficient reason could bear and might be restricted truthfully to another. Thus, Navarre's opinion on the later deposition would here be substantially correct.

It may now be stated, though doubtless it is already known, that a sufficient reason must obtain before mental restriction is lawful. 'Licitum est, justa causa, uti restrictione non pure mentali, etiam cum juramento.'<sup>1</sup> Just as an officer may erect a false battery—it is the truthful expression of his own mind—to shield himself from the enemy's fire and conceal his own battery, so, too, may a person employ mental restriction to ward off attacks of others and to withhold and guard information he may lawfully refuse to give. It is right to use one truth, if an adequate reason exists, to withhold and safeguard hidden truth, even where others deceive themselves.

Yet, mental restriction, however lawful and good within its legitimate sphere, 'positis ponendis,' is at times fraught with many pitfalls. The words of Dr. Cronin are here to the point and merit serious reflection:—

The use of mental restriction is not without its dangers. It is easy to transgress the bounds of veracious statement by attempting to use words in restricted meanings, for often *such meanings do not genuinely attach to them*. Besides, a habit of using mental restrictions is likely to create a facility in imagining as possible what really are impossible meanings, and often leads to the formation of a lax conscience in the matter of speaking truth. Very cute and over careful people, who take a delight in hiding their thoughts from others, are likely to become too venturesome in the use of mental restrictions, and often in this way come to be regarded as, and to be, liars.<sup>2</sup>

JOSEPH BRODIE BROSNAN.

<sup>1</sup> St. Alphonsus, *ibid.* n. 452.

<sup>2</sup> *Science of Ethics*, vol. ii. pp. 78, 79.

# THE DEBT THE WORLD OWES TO THE CHURCH

BY REV. STEPHEN J. ROCHE

HERE in England, where for the last three centuries the Catholic Church has been persecuted and oppressed, we are perhaps inclined to look upon that Church merely as 'the salt of the earth,' working, it is true, for the cause of the Divine Founder, but doing that work in silence and obscurity. It is my intention, therefore, to present her to you under a different aspect—not only as 'the salt of the earth' but also as the 'shining light of the world,' as the organization which, in the words of Mr. Gladstone,

has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of human civilization, and has driven, harnessed to its chariot, as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world. Its learning [he says] has been the learning of the world, its art the art of the world, its genius the genius of the world, its greatness, glory, grandeur, and majesty have been almost all that in these respects the world has had to boast of.

But, first of all, consider for a few moments what the infant Church had to fight against. Go back two thousand years and walk through the streets of Rome, then at the height of its power. The Roman soldier has by now ceased to bear the burden of discipline and fatigue, to love fighting for the very dangers of the game. Enjoyment has become the national god. The plunder gained from foreign conquests has been gathered together for consumption at home, and what were once comforts are now considered needs, and luxuries comforts. Gluttony and debauchery have spread throughout society, ruining body, soul, and fortune, and bringing in their trail crime and immorality of every description. See the yellow Tiber, as it sweeps by the marble palaces, by the temples and luxurious baths, bearing upon its waters the lifeless bodies of pure, innocent, holy childhood. Yes, for one of the Roman laws gives to parents the right to keep only as many of their children as they



please, and to sell or kill the others, or even to cast them out to be devoured by beasts.

Woman, too, in those days of Rome's pre-eminence, was little more than the white slave of man. He had dominion over her property, and in some places over her life also. To him public life—or at least life in public—was everything, his home and family-life hardly counted at all. Divorce was of almost daily occurrence. Such a view of marriage had its inevitable consequence, and a foul blot on Rome that consequence was.

Turn now to the amphitheatre and see how the first nation in the world treated her prisoners. They were either taken into the arena and made to butcher one another for the amusement of the bloodthirsty populace; or, if they escaped this fate, they were put up for auction and sold to the highest bidder. The position of the slave is so well known that there is scarcely need to mention it. He was the property of his master in the same sense as a dog or horse. The very text of the law speaks of 'slaves and other animals.'

He had no legal rights. His master could kill, mutilate, torture, chain, or imprison him at pleasure and with impunity. The only workman of his time, he was a workman without any wages, and with only what food his master chose to allow him. He worked under dread of the lash or of imprisonment, at the caprice of his owner or overseer. His condition was helpless, and nearly hopeless. He cringed and flattered and lied to gain his master's good will. With these slaves the rich man's house was packed. The extent of the evil may be estimated from the number of slaves, of whom in the year 30 A.D. there were 20,832,000 in Italy, as compared with 9,900,000 freemen.

But what else could we expect to arise out of the principles of paganism?

It is easy [explains Lactantius, the Christian Cicero of the fourth century], it is easy to see that the worshippers of false gods could not be good and upright men. For how could they be expected to refrain from shedding human blood, who worshipped gods that shed blood, as did Mars and Bellona? How could they spare even their own parents who adored Jupiter, who drove away his own father? How could they be merciful to their own infant children who venerated Saturn, the devourer of his children? How could purity have any value in the eyes of those who paid divine honours to an adultress, Venus, who had been nothing more than the common victim of the lusts of all the gods? How could rapine and fraud be avoided by men who knew the thefts

committed by their god Mercury, who also taught them that cheating was not fraud, but smartness? How could they restrain their passions who venerated Hercules, Bacchus, and Apollo as gods, while their lusts and frightful lasciviousness of very blackest dye were not only known to the learned, but brought out upon the stage of the theatre, and made the choice material of songs that everyone might the more surely know them? Could men, however good naturally, be good under such training? Or be upright, while taught injustice by the gods? To appease the god you adore, you must do the things you know to be pleasing and agreeable to him. The most devout worshippers are those who seek to imitate their god; and thus truly did the worship of the gods destroy the morals of the heathens.

Into this seething mass of moral corruption came the twelve fishermen, charged with the conversion of the world. What a task! But did they shrink from it? Time has shown that, for two hundred and fifty years, they and their band of followers were compelled to conceal themselves in the catacombs; but that time was not wasted. They instructed in the teaching of Christ the ever-increasing numbers of disciples, and thus gradually and quietly prepared men's minds for what was to come. Then, eventually, they emerged from the darkness of their subterranean home to take part, under a Christian emperor (Constantine), in the government of the Empire. By their teaching, with the aid of the law, they reformed the family life—the very foundation of every well-ordered State—by raising the position of woman and by making the rearing and education of children to be a bond of unity between husband and wife.

At their suggestion the Christian emperors and, later on, the barbarian kings lightened the burdens of the slave: they took away from their masters the power of life and death, gave the slave redress at law, and sanctioned his marriage. To the Church alone does he owe his rescue. She gave him a home, a wife, his children; she gave him security in retaining the fruits of his labour; she gave him a prospect of happiness and content.

Then came the overthrow of Rome. The savage hordes of barbarians from the North swept in successive waves over the fairest provinces of Europe, carrying all before them and leaving behind them only desolation and distress. It must have seemed to the Church as if the work of four centuries had been swept away. But she was not to be overcome. She gazed upon these countless hosts; she marvelled at their energy; and these very men who had hitherto been fittingly called 'the scourge of God,' she



determined to make the instruments for the accomplishment of her work—to transform them into Christian missionaries—a bold task ; but a hundred years later her task was done, and the descendants of these same pagan and ignorant hordes passed up again in their thousands and tens of thousands to their Northern homes, carrying with them the faith and civilization which they had received at the ‘feet of the Apostles.’ This very transformation speaks volumes for the influence and power of the Church as an instrument of progress, as the nurse of civilization.

Gradually the principles of Christianity spread from these nations over the whole of Europe until, before the close of the twelfth century, all the nations of Europe were ranked under the banners of the Church—‘the fiery Celt, the hardy Northman, the stolid Teuton, the gay-hearted Spaniard, and the phlegmatic Saxon—differing in all things save one, their readiness to lay down their lives ungrudgingly in the cause of their common faith.’

But the Church did not confine her attention to Europe. Her messengers had gone forth to Africa and Asia. Slowly but surely they pushed their way further and further, till even China, and later on America, were made the fields of their labours. There is not a nation on the whole face of the earth which does not owe what civilization it had to the Catholic Church. In confirmation of this you need only observe those countries which remained unconverted, and those which accepted Christianity and afterwards rejected it. As an example take China. The Chinese, we are told, ought to be amongst the most civilized nations of the world. They have everything which tends to make people highly civilized, except Christianity, and because they refused this they remain to-day comparatively uncivilized. Or look at France, once so gloriously Christian. In the mad paroxysm of the Revolution she sought to throw off the Christian yoke, and by one wild, desperate spring she plunged into the chasm of worse than paganism, and in consequence lost her civilization. The mere humanitarian theories of infidel philosophies could not raise her. When tried they melted in the sunshine, like the waxen pinions of Icarus. The civilizing influence is based, not on some sort of soothing influence which softens the heart, but on doctrinal teaching, which, for instance, by making known the existence of future life and no repentance after death, prevents countless crimes.

And now we must retrace our steps. When the Church had secured the abolition of slavery, the freed man had not liberty, as we now understand the term. He was taken from under the absolute dominion and caprice of his master, but he remained bound down to the soil and under the obligation of paying certain fixed services to his lord. This condition was called serfdom, and from it arose the feudal system. The position of the serf was a great improvement on his former position, but it was not sufficient for the Church. She had all along proclaimed the dignity of labour. Her Divine Founder Himself had worked as a carpenter; and St. Paul, speaking of himself and his companions, tells us (1 Cor. iv. 22), 'We labour working with our hands,' and (2 Tim. iii. 10), 'If any man will not work, neither let him eat.' Hence, as the Church spread, there grew along with her an appreciation of labour. By displaying to the world, in the person of the monks, a multitude of men who worked for work's sake, and for a still higher motive, she gradually removed the stigma and contempt which had been attached to labour, she restrained the tyranny and oppression of the master, and eventually, by thus working on the minds of the employers, she even secured the manumission of the serf.

Meanwhile another type of workman had sprung up. Under the feudal system of tenure were included those towns where trades or crafts had congregated, and the overlords, perceiving the advantage of these crafts, demanded a portion of their product instead of bodily service. Then, as the crafts flourished, they began to impose taxes, which increased as trade prospered. This urged the townsmen to unite into a general association or guild. The lord therefore found that, instead of having to deal with only one or two offenders, he had the whole town to face, and the result was a compromise. Finally, as the towns grew prosperous from trade, and the lords grew needy from war and extravagance, the townsmen negotiated for a charter, and by paying down a lump sum of money or a fixed annual amount, they succeeded in freeing themselves altogether from the interference of the lords.

But guilds existed long before the organization of the trades, and the liberation of the towns from the dominion of their feudal lord. Long before this religious guilds appeared throughout Europe. We have not time to enter into an explanation of the work done by these religious



guilds; but their object was to spiritualize the workmen, to foster good-feeling among them, to enlist sympathy and charity for one another, and to sustain comparative happiness and content. Every kind of distress among the workers met with sympathy and assistance—sickness, poverty, old age, infirmity, losses, misfortune, and even imprisonment. Each guild had a religious purpose, each had a patron saint, whose feast was celebrated as a gala day. They included all classes of society, rich and poor, men and women, priests and laymen, who were thus brought together in brotherhood.

It was on these religious guilds that the craft guilds were modelled. After the town had secured its freedom, and its spokesmen and delegates had become the town council, the municipality began to manage its own affairs. But soon the individual crafts perceived their interests to be threatened by the ordinances of the Corporation; and just as the whole town had organized to resist the oppression to the lord, 'so now each craft formed into a separate guild to oppose the exactions of the town authorities. They instinctively took the constitution of the existing religious guilds as a model, adopted many of their observances—e.g., patron saint, Masses, chaplain, mutual help, etc.—and added to them ordinances suitable to their trade.' Thus, not only did the Church provide the system of guilds and put it into operation, but even in the craft guilds her influence is clearly indicated. And of these guilds we cannot speak too highly. 'It is quite certain,' writes Professor Thorold Rogers, a Protestant historian, who devoted the whole of his life to the study of the economic history of England, 'it is quite certain that town and country guilds obviated pauperism in the Middle Ages. They assisted in steadying the price of labour, and formed a permanent centre for those associations which fulfilled the function that, in more recent times, trade unions have striven to satisfy.'<sup>1</sup>

They undertook towards their members the duties now frequently performed by hospitals, almshouses, burial clubs, and guardians of the poor. We do not mean to imply that

<sup>1</sup> James Edwin Thorold Rogers was a big economist who died in 1890. He taught economics in London, Oxford University, Worcester College, and later at Oxford again. He published works on Economics and Economic History, including 'History of Agriculture and Prices' (6 volumes) from which these quotations are taken. Abbot Gasquet says of him that no one has ever worked more fully at the economic history of England.

poverty and hardness of life did not exist in Catholic times ; but what did not exist was that peculiar product which sprang up so plentifully amid the ruins of Catholic institutions overthrown by the Tudor sovereigns, namely, pauperism. There were, on the whole, none of those extremes of poverty and wealth which have excited the astonishment of philanthropists, and are now exciting the indignation of workmen. The age had its discontents, but of poverty which perishes unheeded, of a willingness to do honest work and a lack of opportunity for doing it, there was little or none. Wages were unchallenged, strikes were needless, excessive toil was restricted, brotherhood was established, homes were decent, accidents were provided for, old age was not feared, and few were unemployed. The exact share of the Church in attaining this state of content may be undefined, but her handiwork is proclaimed in the ordinances of the guilds. Let us hear the tribute paid to her work by one or two Protestant writers. Mr. Lecky, in his *History of Rationalism in Europe*, tells us that

by consolidating the heterogeneous and anarchical elements that succeeded the downfall of the Roman Empire, by infusing into Christendom the conception of a bond of unity that is superior to the divisions of nationhood, and of a moral tie which is superior to force, by softening slavery into serfdom, and preparing the way for the ultimate emancipation of labour, Catholicism laid the very foundation of civilization of labour. Herself the most admirable of all organizations, there was formed beneath her influence a vast network of organizations—political, municipal, and social—which supplied a large proportion of the materials of almost every modern structure.

And the French historian Guizot, in his *History of Civilization*, more than corroborates the Englishman. ‘No society,’ he writes, ‘ever made more vigorous efforts to make her influence felt, and to mould to her own form the world around her. Her influence on modern civilization had been immense, greater, perhaps, than has ever been imagined by her most ardent adversaries or her most zealous advocates.’

Consider the work done by the monasteries. The work of charity, the feeding of the hungry, the clothing of the poor, the administering to the sick, the comforting of the widow, the fostering the fatherless, these all fell upon the monasteries—or rather the monasteries took them upon themselves. The great order of Benedictines devoted itself especially to the healing of the sick ; and nearly all the great medical schools of Europe owe their origin to the



hospices attached to the monasteries. We need only mention the schools of Salerno, Montpelier, Bologna, and Padua, all dating from the twelfth century at the latest, and still flourishing to-day. The Church, at the Synod of Aix, in the year 816, issued a decree that every ecclesiastical foundation, whether of canons or monks, should provide accommodation for the poor and the sick, for orphans and widows, for pilgrims and strangers. To be poor or miserable, hungry or sick, were the only passports asked for at their ever-open hospital doors. Yet all this was during the so-called 'dark ages.'

Whence, too, sprang those Orders of men who devoted their lives to the glorious purpose of ransoming the Christians in Mohammedan captivity? See them not only collecting money to redeem the prisoners, but when other means failed, even exchanging places with them, and offering their hands to the prison chains of the Mussulman, and their bodies to the lashes of the task-master, in order that men with families could return home to support their wives and children.

Look again at the amount of good done by the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, St. John of God, St. John Baptist de la Salle, Don Bosco, the Little Sisters of the Poor, and others too numerous to mention, and ask yourselves what social evil has there ever been, throughout the whole history of the Christian era, which the Church has not sought to relieve by her Orders, her Congregations, and her Institutions.

But her efforts did not even end here. After emancipating and healing the body, the endowment of the minds of her children was her next great work.

Her ten thousand monasteries [writes the eminent English Protestant Canon Farrar] kept alive and transmitted the torch of learning which otherwise would have been extinguished long before. A religious education, incomparably superior to the mere athleticism of the noble's hall, was extended to the meanest serf who wished for it. This fact alone [he says], by proclaiming the dignity of the individual, elevated the entire hopes and destinies of the race. The humanizing machinery of the schools and Universities, the civilizing propaganda of missionary zeal, were they not due to her?

To whom, pray, do we owe the preservation of ancient literature? They fled before the barbarians of the North and the fanatics of the South, at the time of Rome's down-

fall, and carried with them into the wilderness the books they possessed. Here, and even after their return, a good part of their time was spent in transcribing manuscripts. We are told of one of them—Maurus Lapi by name—belonging to the fifth century, who copied a thousand volumes in less than fifty years; and during the short rule of Abbot Desiderius at Monte Cassino, his monks wrote out St. Austin's fifty homilies, his letters, his comments upon the Sermon on the Mount, upon St. Paul and upon Genesis; parts of St. Jerome and St. Ambrose, part of St. Bede, St. Leo's sermons, the Orations of St. Gregory Nazianzen; the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse; various histories, including that of St. Gregory of Tours, Josephus on the Jewish War, Justinian's Institutes, and many other ascetic and other works; and of the classics, Cicero, *De natura Deorum*; Terence, Ovid's *Fasti*, Horace, and Virgil.

One of the earliest rules of their Order, moreover, enjoined that the children of the parents without distinction should find a free education in every monastery. Thus every monastery was a free school; and so, too, from the fifth to the tenth century, was every Bishop's house.

And, passing on to secondary education, it is to the Church that the world owes its universities, its law schools, and its great libraries, its science, its art and its literature. Of the 150 universities which exist to-day, 118 were founded by Catholics, and 72 of them before the Reformation. Nor were these mere second-rate grammar schools, with some few dozen scholars. In 1262 the number of students attending the lectures at the great Bologna University amounted to 20,000; and at Oxford, in 1232, the numbers had risen to 30,000; while the membership of the various 'nations' attending the lectures at the University of Paris during that same century frequently exceeded 40,000. Neither were they wanting in capable lecturers. Among the list of professors of the last-mentioned University, namely, that of Paris, we find that of Abelard, the founder of the Scholastic Philosophy; of St. Bernard and William of Champeaux; and of their perhaps more famous pupils, Albert Magnus, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus, the subtle defender of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Bologna, too, was the nurse of most of our valued legal conceptions. The remnants of Roman Law, smothered as



they were for a time in the ruins of the Empire, were thus nursed back to life, and became the germs from which the principles of modern equity have been evolved, and on which has been built the great international code, which to-day binds the concert of nations. It was the Benedictine monk, Gratian, who introduced the study of canon and civil law into the University, and the Dominican Order which fostered that study in its infancy.

The modern Englishman openly boasts of the foundation on which the English Constitution rests, forgetful, perhaps, of the Roman Cardinal and Catholic noblemen who wrung the Magna Charta from King John, and ignorant of the fact that, if he opens the very first page of our legal records and reads 'Ethelbert's Doms,' he will see the work of the great Roman missionary, St. Augustine, mentioned there. If he doubts it, St. Bede tells us in his history that King Ethelbert died; who, besides other good deeds which he did to his people, established also for them, by the advice of his wise men, laws, according to the examples of the Romans, which, written in the tongue of the angels, are preserved to this day and kept by them.

The intellectual forces of the Dark Ages might best be shown by an appeal to the realm of theology and philosophy, both to the books which were written and to the controversies which raged, some of them for several centuries; but this point I shall pass over—merely calling to your notice, as perhaps the best example, St. Thomas's profound work, the *Summa Theologia*.

Speaking of books, moreover, brings to mind the great libraries of the world. The Vatican Library was founded as early as the sixth century (and that of St. Gall in 830). Every monastery had its library; and, according to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the great university libraries of Berlin, Leipzig, Heidelberg, Utrecht, and others were formed out of the monastic libraries of the Dominicans, Benedictines, Augustinians, and other Catholic Orders, stolen from their owners by the followers of Luther and Calvin.

The influence of the Church on Architecture and the Fine Arts, on all those contrivances with which genius or patience had desired to embellish civilization must not be passed by unnoticed. Remember the condition of Europe after the fall of Rome. Goth, Hun, Vandal, and Moslem had done their work; the heart of the vast Empire was broken, her ancient glory and art were shattered for ever. 'It was

this lifeless body,' says Sir Gilbert Scott, Professor of Architecture, 'which Christianity had to awaken to new energy—this dull and spiritless lamp of which she had to mould her future arts'; and, he adds, 'that such a glorious result as the Byzantine architecture should have been produced out of materials so lifeless, and through the agency of a decaying nation, speaks volumes for the power of religion over art.' And Professor Smirke, R.A., speaks not less highly:—

The medieval artist [he says] appealed sometimes to the imagination and sometimes to conscience, and thus gave a degree of sentiment to his works which moderns can scarcely attempt, much less attain. Art is here employed to impress the great lessons of truth, the warfare of the world, the subjugation of the natural to the spiritual man, the honest employment of the intellect in the cause of religion. It is the 'glorious earnestness' of the Gothic style that renders it impossible to imitate.

Let the average English Protestant who decries the Middle Ages go look upon the magnificent abbeys and cathedrals that have escaped the vandalism of the Reformation, and the ruins of those buildings that the Reformers have not altogether destroyed; let him go to St. Mark's in Venice, and view the works of four generations of artists who devoted their lives to this one edifice; let him look upon the works of Fra Angelico and of Fra Bartolomeo, both Dominican friars, and of a hundred others; let him look at these and ask himself could the age which witnessed the execution of these buildings and the works of these artists have been shrouded in the hopeless ignorance he has been led to believe.

As regards science, too, the muster roll of its former men contains few brighter names than those who from the monasteries, medieval schools, and universities held aloft the lamp of scientific knowledge. We can claim in Copernicus the father of modern astronomy, and in Pope Sylvester II the father of modern arithmeticians. We owe the introduction of algebra into Europe to a Venetian friar, named Luca Bougo (1494). In the science of chemistry, too, the name of the Franciscan, Roger Bacon, is known to the wide world; and the great Dominican, Albertus Magnus, though less known because his greater fame as a speculative philosopher has over-shadowed his other attainments, was a great master of the practical chemistry of his time. Medicine owes a vast amount to the great medical schools of the 'dark ages'; and to two Catholics,



Cisulpius and Jussien, we are indebted for the modern system of botany.

Amongst the many others who have made their mark on the history of the world's progress, we may mention a few who deserve greater notice than we can give them here. Such were Anastasius, the Roman librarian (Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres); St. Peter Damien, a Roman Cardinal; Lanfranc and Anselm, both Archbishops of Canterbury; and St. Bruno, founder of the Order of Carthusians. And if we should be asked what has become of the books of most of these learned men, Tyrrell's *History of England*, published in 1700, will give the answer, or Wood's *History of Oxford University*, where the scandalous fanaticism of the early Reformers in burning and otherwise destroying the valued monuments of Catholic learning is denounced in the strongest terms.

But this was not the only destruction caused by the Reformers. The Reformation was primarily a *social and economic* revolution, the true meaning of which was in the event successfully disguised under the cloak of religion. Abbot Gasquet, in his *Christian Democracy in Pre-Reformation Days*, says: 'It was a rising, not of the poor and needy against the well-to-do, but of the rich against the poor—the violent seizure by the new men in power of the funds and property which generations of benefactors had intended for the relief of the needy, by educational and other endowments to assist the poor man to rise in the social scale.' The well-to-do classes in the process became richer and more prosperous, whilst the masses became, as an old writer has it, 'mere stark beggars.' Before the Reformation pauperism was a thing unknown; but after the Reformation it was visible throughout the length and breadth of the land, so that in the eighty years which followed the overthrow of the old system it was necessary for Parliament to pass no fewer than twelve Acts dealing with its relief. Underlying the social principles which were the cause of this distress was the new idea of property in the sense of absolute ownership, in place of the older and more Christian idea of property in the sense of stewardship, to be employed by the owner as the minister of God's Providence for the benefit of others.

This leads me to say a few concluding words on the condition of labour in Europe to-day. Nowadays we are confronted by industrialism, and its attendant evils of

unemployment and labour unrest. The problem seems insoluble. But let the glorious march of the Church through the ages give us heart. The Church says, 'I have experience and knowledge. Capitalists and labourists accept my principles and the problem will solve itself.' The Church's task is not to enter the mart of the world and arrange tariffs and equitable systems, but to see that her eternal principles of justice are ever before the world to guide it on the path of real progress.

STEPHEN J. ROCHE.



# THE ABBEY OF SS. PETER AND PAUL, NEWTOWN, TRIM

BY VERY REV. PHILIP CALLARY, P.P., V.G.

IN the February number of the I. E. RECORD I wrote a short article on St. John's Priory, Newtown, Trim, and pointed out the useful purpose it had served for many centuries as the great central hospital for Co. Meath, more especially for the sick poor around Trim, who found there a harbour of refuge when stricken down by illness and unable to obtain in their own humble homes the proper surgical and medical treatment which they needed. Close by this highly charitable institute one cannot help noticing, on the opposite side of the Boyne, a cluster of ruins occupying a prominent position on the northern bank of the river.

On the occasion of my first visit to this classic locality I was anxious to find out something about the past history of these curious old ruins, and must say that, notwithstanding many inquiries from the people in the neighbourhood, I failed to get a satisfactory account from any of them. Next day I was more fortunate when I happened to meet an intelligent old man who took me around, and told me all he knew himself, or had heard from the old neighbours and the people at home.

In reply to my queries he told me, in his own simple language, that the bridge on which we stood, with its five finely-chiselled stone arches, was a far better building than the bridge in Trim, and was always called by his neighbours St. Peter's Bridge; and the old ruins yonder, overhanging the Boyne, was SS. Peter and Paul's Abbey; whilst the stately building higher up was a church where the monks of the Abbey used to say Mass, hear confessions, give Holy Communion to the people, and recite their own Divine Office in choir. When we came into the old graveyard, he pointed out a small building, near the entrance gate, which, he told me, was the old parish church of Newtown Clonbun. Within the walls of this chapel, immediately

outside the sanctuary, there is an altar-shaped tomb, a real work of art, worthy of close inspection. It is enclosed on all sides with cut stone. On the top slab there are two life-size recumbent figures, beautifully carved, with a sword of state lying between them. These figures represent Sir Lucas Dillon and his wife, Lady Jane Bathe, who are interred here. The north and south sides of the tomb are divided into three compartments by exquisitely wrought bas-reliefs, containing the armorial bearings of the Dillon family, and the Baths, Barnwalls, and some of the other illustrious families with which the Dillons were connected by marriage.<sup>1</sup> The carved figures on the front stone represent the marriage of the illustrious pair. The receding group of figures, four on either side, are the friends belonging to both families who were present at the interesting ceremony. The stone on the east end of the monument has a raised sculptured tablet, evidently intended for an inscription, which, strange to say, was never put on, although it is given in Lodge's *Peerage* :—

Militis Hic Lucae Dillonis ossa quiescunt  
 Conciliis Regni summus Baroque supremus  
 Mense Februarii decimus cum septimus instat  
 Tempora lustrali profusus flumine clausit  
 Terrenos linquens coelestes sumpsit honores.

Before parting with my intelligent old guide he directed me, on my return journey to Trim, to stay for a moment or so at an iron gate opposite the old ruins and speak across the Boyne to the venerable piles on its northern bank, and I would be sure to hear one of the finest echoes in Ireland. Having followed his directions, I found, when speaking only in a conversational tone, a reverberation, giving me back immediately every word and syllable of my voice with such remarkable distinctness that I can fully endorse the statement made to me about the superior character of this Newtown echo.

Now, these various items of information, although scrappy, are good enough as far as they go, but they do not go sufficiently far, as they leave us in the dark regarding many important details. They tell us nothing about the date of the foundation of these various old buildings, or the name of the original founder, or the

<sup>1</sup> One of the above Dillons, Thomasine, eldest daughter of Henry Dillon, Kentstown, Co. Meath, was married to a Plunkett, Loughcrew, and was the mother of Blessed Oliver Plunkett.



purpose for which they were built, or the length of time they served these purposes, or the causes which led to their final destruction. To let in a little light on these interesting points and put them in their proper perspective is the object of the present paper.

If a person stands on St. Peter's Bridge, on the public road spanning the Boyne, and takes a view of the various old buildings, the first thing that strikes him is the admirable position in which they are placed. Standing out in the open country on a rich verdant bank, gently sloping down to the edge of the Boyne, these venerable piles in the heyday of their glory must have presented a fine appearance. Sir William Wilde when collecting materials for his well-known work, *The Beauties of the Boyne and Blackwater*, paid a prolonged visit to Trim, inspecting the many monuments of antiquity with which this old historic town is studded. When he came to those at Newtown the first thing that caught his artistic eye was the splendid site selected by those who were responsible for these buildings, and in his rare book, now out of print, he tells us the impression these buildings made upon him :—

Unlike the military and ecclesiastical ruins of many other localities in Ireland, choked by the dilapidated buildings of some wretched dirty town, like the rank weeds of a neglected garden obscuring its urns and statues, those of Newtown, Trim, stand alone and distinct on the swelling bank of the river, whose stream here seems to linger by them, as if in memory of their bygone splendour, and stretch, without even a wall or fence to break the foreground, over nearly an acre of the richest turf and surrounded by the greenest verdure in the broad plains of Meath.<sup>1</sup>

It is needless to say, the picture drawn in this grand purple passage is not exactly true to life. One, however, may find some excuse for it when he visits the spot and tries to take in all the surroundings. For here, as a matter of fact, the Boyne is at one of its widest stretches, as may be seen from the length of St. Peter's Bridge, and the number of eyes through which the water passes. Here also the river is of considerable depth, and glides along so noiselessly and with such unruffled surface that one can scarcely detect the motion of its waters. It is this fact, no doubt, that gave rise to the bold conceit which represents the stream as seeming to stand still in order to linger on the beauty of the buildings perched upon its verdant banks.

<sup>1</sup> Wilde, pp. 99-101.

Alfred Conwell, M.R.I.A., when stationed in Trim as District Inspector of National Schools, spent a good deal of his spare time knocking about the ancient buildings of Trim. In a booklet which he published at that time with the quaint title *A Ramble Round Trim*, he gives us his views regarding many of the old ruins which he repeatedly visited. Of those that are the subject of the present paper, without indulging in any flights of fancy or in the language of poetry he contents himself with a simple endorsement of the statement made by Dean Butler that these buildings at Newtown, 'even in their present state of crumbling decay, give proof of the architectural skill of the Anglo-Normans in the beginning of the thirteenth century.'<sup>1</sup>

To enable us to form an idea of their proportions he gives us a detailed measurement of their various parts. Of the two blocks of buildings on the Boyne bank which constituted the residence of the Canons Regular of St. Austin, he tells us the breadth of the building nearest to the river is 48 ft., measured externally, with a side wall extending parallel with the river to the length of 95 ft., and in some places still 32 ft. high. The adjoining structure, on higher ground, was originally 45½ ft. in length, and 30 ft. in width, containing in one angle a stone staircase, portions of which are still remaining.

The stately edifice situated higher up on the hillside, with its tall lancet windows, is the ancient cathedral of Meath, dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul, and by far the most imposing of all the ruins on the banks of the Boyne. Competent authorities on ecclesiastical architecture do not hesitate to say that 'it is one of the most elegant structures and perhaps one of the earliest specimens of the light-pointed Gothic in the kingdom.'<sup>2</sup> It consisted of a simple nave, without aisles or transept, 136 ft. in length by 30 ft. in breadth, internally. The side walls being 40 ft. in height and 5½ ft. thick.

There are two passages or triforia in the thickness of the walls at the west end.<sup>3</sup> There also are to be seen the beautiful remains in Caen stone of the springing of a groined roof. At the opposite or east end of the church

<sup>1</sup> *A Ramble Round Trim*, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Wilde, pp. 91, 92.

<sup>3</sup> These internal intramural passages, strange as they may appear to us, were common enough at that period. We find them, for instance, in Wye, St. James Deeping, Ripon, and other churches, and must have been found useful for inspection and repairs to roof and clerestory windows, and perhaps also for protective and defensive purposes.



there are two 'sedilia (seats)' on the south side of the altar, with round-headed arches. These both measure 5 ft. in height, 6 ft. 10 in. across, and are 2 ft. 8 in. in receding depth.<sup>1</sup> From the red sandstone, of which they are composed, as well as from the style and character of the structure, it is clear they were put there at different times from the rest of the building.

During the night of the 'big wind,' 6th January, 1839, a considerable portion of the south side wall was blown down, but in the parts of the church still standing there are seven windows, of which two on the north and one on the south side wall are still perfect in form. Each is 6 ft. wide on the outside, splaying to 7½ ft. on the inside. They are 24 ft. high, starting about 12 ft. above the floor and reaching to within three or four feet of the top of the side wall. The large window which had been over the high altar, and now open to the bottom, is 10 ft. wide and about 8 ft. higher than those on the side walls.

Now, the person to whom is due the chief credit of founding and building this magnificent church, together with the adjoining premises constituting the Abbey, is acknowledged by all historians to be Simon Rochfort, the first Englishman who wore the mitre of Meath. In the year 1194, when Eugene, Bishop of Clonard, died,<sup>2</sup> Simon Rochfort became his duly appointed successor. After six or seven years spent in Clonard he resolved to change his episcopal see to Trim. There is no need to go fully into the reasons which prompted him to make the change. It is enough to remember that whilst Clonard, at this time and for years before, was on the decline, Trim was in the ascendant, and fast becoming the great stronghold of the Pale. Besides, Trim had the advantage of being a more central place for the government of the diocese than Clonard, which, Dr. Healy observes, 'is beside the boundary line of the northern and southern halves of Ireland.'<sup>3</sup> The moment he got settled down in Trim he forthwith under-

<sup>1</sup> *A Ramble Round Trim*, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> This date appears to have been first set down by Harris in his edition of Ware's Bishops; cf. Cogan, i. 70. A recent writer (Lawlor, *Life of St. Bernard*, p. 50) put Eugene's death at 1191, no doubt following an entry in the *Annals of Loch Ce* at that year. Orpen, *Ireland under the Normans*, ii. 114, argues that Simon de Rochfort was not consecrated Bishop of Meath until about 1198-1199. The whole question of the dates of these Bishops requires special investigation.

<sup>3</sup> *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. iv. p. 69.

took the task of building a cathedral church worthy of the diocese and also a residence for the priests whom he meant to put in charge. Having finished both in the short space of four years, he handed over the control to the Canons Regular of St. Austin. They are called by Dean Cogan and other historians Canons Regular of the Congregation of St. Victor, but this title does not mean to imply that they belonged to a different Order from the Austin Canons, but only denotes the religious house from which they came, the famous Abbey of St. Victor, outside Paris, which was founded by Louis le Gros in 1113, and was distinguished, not only for the religious spirit which was always preserved within its walls, but for the high place it held in the annals of science during the Middle Ages.

These Victorine Canons, it may be well to bear in mind, lived in community, were bound by the usual vows, and owed obedience to their Prior as their immediate superior, but were not exempt from the jurisdiction of the Bishop, Simon Rochfort, who installed them in their home at Newtown in the year 1206. The religious habit worn by these Canons was white. They were privileged also to wear the rochet, with a black cloak over all for outside wear. In choir they wore a black amice over their shoulders in summer, and in winter a black cloak.

The first Prior, William, installed at Newtown paid annually to the Bishop a sum of five marks as proxies, thereby acknowledging his subjection to the Ordinary of the place. These proxies were also paid by his successors, and for the same reason.

Besides the observance of the rules of their institute and the recital of the Divine Office in choir, they were bound to all the duties discharged in the church, just the same as if they were secular priests. For it must be remembered that the church at Newtown was not a mere private oratory attached to the Abbey, or even an ordinary parochial church to which all the faithful had a right of access; but was, furthermore, the cathedral for the entire diocese, where the Bishop had his *cathedra* or throne, and where he presided at all solemn functions, blessed the oils on Holy Thursday, called together the clergy of the diocese on retreat, or met them in synod, as well as all other important occasions which might require their presence for the transaction of business of more than local importance.

The extensive diocese of Meath in former times consisted



of {a number of small sees, with its own prelate ruling over each of them—Clonard, Duleek, Dunshaughlin, Trim, Kells, Slane, Skryne, and Ardraccan. There were besides *chorepiscopi* attached to abbeys, like the famous abbey of St. Fechin Fore. At the National Synod held at Kells, March 9, 1152, presided over by John Paparo, Cardinal-Priest, and Christian, Bishop of Lismore, Papal Legate, it was laid down in the preamble that these smaller sees, like other similar ones throughout Ireland, should be reduced in number, at the first convenient opportunity. Accordingly, several of the small sees in the palatinate of Meath ceased on the death of their respective Bishops, the only surviving ones being Clonard, Duleek, Kells : Clonard, for the western portion down to the Shannon ; Duleek and Kells for the eastern portion running along the sea down to the Co. Cavan. Subsequently Duleek ceased to be a separate see, and also Kells, whose Bishop died in 1211, and the see of Clonard, as we have seen, had been already transferred to Trim.

In the year 1216 there was a famous synod held at Newtown, Trim, presided over by Simon Rochfort, the first Bishop who had the right to assume the title of Bishop of Meath.<sup>1</sup> This synod, held at Newtown, has been always deemed one of great importance, inasmuch as it was the first real attempt to give effect to the national decrees of Kells, not only by the abolition of the small sees, but also by the appointment of arch-presbyters, who would have certain duties to perform beyond the boundaries of the parish where they had their permanent residence. These arch-presbyters, who were appointed by the Ordinary and received their jurisdiction from him, corresponded somewhat to the rural Deans or Vicars-Forane of the present day. What their special duties were may be seen from the decrees given at the end of this paper, which, no doubt, will be interesting reading, especially for those ecclesiastics who wish to keep in touch with the ancient history of the Irish Church, and to recall the zealous efforts that had been made by the spiritual rulers of those days to repair the ravages caused by the repeated incursions of the Danes and the internecine warfare carried on so ruthlessly by such wretched Irishmen as O'Rourke of Breiffney and Dermot MacMorrough, who

<sup>1</sup> Eugene of Clonard and, long before, Idunan were styled Bishops of Meath, but only by courtesy.

helped to complete the ruin which the Northmen had begun.

On reading over the Newtown decrees one can easily perceive they do not touch upon points of dogma or of faith, but are solely concerned with the reformation of morals and the restoration of order, as well as of ecclesiastical discipline amongst clergy and laity. The reader will also notice the practical nature of these decrees. With the exception of the one regarding public penances, then in vogue throughout the Church, all the others are so much up-to-date that one might easily imagine he was reading canons of the New Code applicable to the Church at the present day.

Eight years after the holding of this synod, Simon Rochfort, the first Anglo-Norman Bishop who ever wore the mitre of Meath, died, and was buried before the high altar of the cathedral church he founded at Newtown<sup>1</sup>; and although some of his flock might not be inclined to take to him quite as warmly as one of their own countrymen, yet no one could help admiring his zeal in the administration of his large diocese, and the marked success he achieved in removing abuses of long standing, and restoring order and discipline amongst the regular and secular clergy under his jurisdiction. We have no reason, therefore, to doubt the accuracy of the description of his character given by Sir James Ware,<sup>2</sup> who records that he carried himself in the episcopal functions with so much fidelity, integrity, and wisdom, especially in establishing the clergy of his diocese, and withal was of such an humble and meek behaviour, that he justly acquired the reputation of a most excellent prelate, one, as Dr. Lanigan adds, who undoubtedly deserved to govern Meath.<sup>3</sup>

After his death the Canons Regular, installed by him at Newtown, continued to discharge all the duties connected with the cathedral until the year 1537, when they were summarily dismissed, and their property and possessions of every sort confiscated to the Crown. The last Prior who ruled at Newtown was Owen Coffy. Like his predecessors in office he held a high position, not only in the ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> Not only Meath but the sees of Connor, Ossory, Leighlin, Down, Waterford, Dublin, and Cork were all ruled then by Anglo-Norman Bishops. *Ware's Bishops*, Wilkins, vol. ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ware's Bishops*, p. 141.

<sup>3</sup> *Lanigan*, vol. iv. p. 322.



hierarchy but also in the affairs of State, in fact, ranked third in dignity and sat as baron in the House of Lords. From the first moment the question of the King's supremacy in spiritual matters was mooted, he threw in the whole weight of his authority against this ridiculous novelty, and in Parliament and out of it opposed it with all the influence at his command. In this strenuous opposition he had behind him not only the members of his own house but the support of every class in the community, as the following letter, written at this crucial time, clearly shows. The letter is addressed to Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General, by George Brown, Archbishop of Dublin, who received a commission to abolish the papal jurisdiction in Ireland. It runs thus :—

MOST HONoured LORD,—Your humble servant, receiving your mandate as one of his highnesse's commissioners hath endeavoured almost to the danger and hazard of his temporal life to procure the nobility and gentry of this Nation to due obedience in owning of his highness as their supreme head. . . . And do find much oppugning therein especially by my brother Armagh, who had withdrawn most of his suffragans and clergy within his see and jurisdiction, laying a curse on the people whoever should own his highnesse's Supremacy. . . . It is convenient to call a Parliament in this Nation to pass the supremacy by act for they do *not much matter his highnesse's commission* :—The common people of this Isle are more zealous in their blindness than the Saints and Martyrs were in the truth at the beginning of the Gospel, etc. 1535, Sept. 4th.<sup>1</sup>

A meeting of the Irish Parliament, as suggested by Brown, was called, and met on the 1st May, 1536, to pass the Act of Royal Supremacy, but so great was the opposition on the part of the clergy and their representatives, that it took a year and a half before it became law, and even then the law could not be put into operation anywhere in Ireland, except by the armed forces of the Crown. When the crisis came at Newtown, the Prior, on behalf of the community, stoutly refused possession of the abbey and church to the Commissioners of Henry VIII, and yielded only to physical force. The eviction took place at the time the Prior had on hands the work of making extensive improvements at the cathedral.

Anyone visiting the old ruins of this splendid structure will observe even now, at the west end, a gable 55 ft. high, with its square-headed window, and will also notice the joining of the new masonry with the old, and even the

<sup>1</sup> Cox, p. 246.

put-holes left after the scaffolding had been torn down by the sacrilegious hands of those employed to accomplish the work of destruction.

Time is telling its tale on the old buildings of church and abbey, so long exposed to wind and weather. The walls are fast crumbling away, but, what is still more deplorable, people around are making no efforts to save the fragments that remain. Quite the contrary. Whenever they want a stone to build a gap or outhouse they go to the old church or abbey and cart away the materials, without scruple or remorse, and make use of them for their own selfish purpose. In the summer of 1877 the late Father Denis Murphy, S.J., an enthusiastic antiquarian and a pretty constant contributor to the pages of the *I. E. RECORD*, asked me to accompany him on a visit to the old monuments of Trim, especially those of Newtown. Whilst highly pleased with the few days spent deciphering the inscriptions on the old tombs, I must say he was greatly shocked at the want of respect shown to the old abbey and the venerable walls of the ancient Catholic Cathedral of Meath. The corbels and carved stones of the doorways, and even pieces of arched tombs, erected to the memory of Simon Rochfort and one of his successors, Bishop Shirwood, were all strewn about and trampled under foot. The only one about Trim who ever seemed to take the least interest in the preservation of those ancient monuments was Dean Butler, Protestant Rector of Trim from 1819 to 1862. During his long residence in Trim he had gathered up carefully as many as possible of the old sculptured stones, and had them built into the old parish church at Newtown, with a small tablet, upon which is cut the following inscription:—

Has Antiquae Pietatis et Artis Reliquias  
 Vicini Monasterii SS. Petro et Paulo Dedicati  
 Olim Ornamenta  
 Prostratas Diu et pene Detritas  
 Parietibus hujus Ecclesiae  
 Infingendas curavit R. B. Vicar de Trim.  
 A.D. MDCCCLXII.<sup>1</sup>

It is the same careful hand that raised up from the

<sup>1</sup> He had been also a careful collector of ancient coins, seals, and curios of every description. In November, 1862, some months after his death, his wife, sister of the well-known writer, Maria Edgeworth, presented this valuable collection to the Royal Irish Academy, where they are open to the inspection of visitors.



debris of the old graveyard a concrete figure, 5 ft. in height, and, though it was without the head and mitre or other insignia of the episcopal office, to prove its identity; yet the Dean, believing it to be the figure of Simon Rochfort, the founder, had it embedded in the western end of the old parish church of Clonbun, whose ruins still stand close to the cathedral. Writing in 1854, the Dean finishes his account of the Priory with the following remarks :—

Many romantic stories of the treasure buried in these ruins were current a few years ago, and not long since hundreds of people, some of them from a considerable distance, assembled here at night and made great excavations in the hope of reaching an underground passage leading to the high altar with the golden candlesticks, by which lie two sleeping Bishops who, when awakened, will give the keys of two small chambers, one full of silver the other full of gold, which may be taken by the bold and pious finders; but the police came upon the scene, interrupted the work, and so the treasure was left undisturbed.

The only excavation in which the Dean himself took an interest was the finding of a considerable piece of lead piping, leading from St. Peter's Well down to the abbey, thereby revealing the source from which the monks obtained their water for table, whilst the Boyne, close by, afforded them an ample supply for all other purposes. About the same time, when the area of the old cathedral church was being cleared out, there was found, near the sanctuary, a quantity of indented tiles used in the flooring, and some pieces of painted and stained glass belonging, in all probability, to the big window over the high altar.

To sum up the salient points of this rather lengthy paper, I may mention that, on the occasion of a recent visit to Trim, I tried to interest some of the young folk there in the history of these old ruins. With this object in view, I brought them to the gate opposite the old walls which had been pointed out to me as the gate of the echo. Speaking across the Boyne, I asked the old man in the walls some questions bearing on my subject. 'Now boys, listen': 'Are you there, old man?' 'Certainly.' 'How long have you been there?' 'Ever since the Canons Regular were put out of the abbey and the roof over [their heads torn down.' 'That's a good many years ago.' 'No doubt it is.' 'When exactly was it?' 'It was in the year 1537, now almost 400 years ago.' 'Might I go much farther back, and ask when the foundation stone of the abbey and of the cathedral church was laid?' 'With pleasure. I remember well: it was in 1202, when Bishop Rochfort

came here from Clonard, and fixed his seat, or see, in Trim, the capital of Royal Meath.' 'When finished, what priests did he put in charge of the abbey and his grand cathedral?' 'When the place was fully finished and furnished, he wrote to the Prior of the famous Abbey of St. Victor, outside Paris, and when they came, he put into their hands the charge of both church and abbey.' 'Did they remain long in their new home?' 'Oh, yes, for years and years, until they were turned out, as I told you, in 1537.' 'Thank you. Good evening.'

I must say the boys around me were highly amused at the conversation carried on between myself and the old man in the walls. I was very glad to see them in such good humour, for it served to show me that our young intelligent boys can be easily induced to take an interest in the history of these old monuments of antiquity scattered over the land, and to do something for their preservation. The elderly people, as a rule, can see no historic value in these old buildings. The only hope, therefore, for their preservation rests with the rising generation, who may be taught to see in them valuable links with the past; standing mementos to remind us of many interesting episodes connected with the chequered history of our country. This was the sentiment to which Father Murphy, S.J., gave expression when, over forty years ago, we were visiting Newtown, Trim, together, and which I find repeated since then in one of the papers he contributed to the I. E. RECORD:—

Let us hope the time is coming when the history of their country will no longer be a closed book to our Irish youth. Then they will begin to look with pious reverence on the spots where their forefathers prayed and suffered, and they will visit the homes of the great men of the country in pious pilgrimage as the Spaniard does the birthplace of St. Ignatius, or with that patriotic feeling which the Scotchman displays to the home of Wallace and of Scott.<sup>1</sup>

## WILKINS CONCILIA, 547.

| <i>Pap. Rom.</i> | <i>Archb. Cant.</i> | <i>A.D.</i> | <i>Reg. Ang.</i> |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|
| HONORIUS III.    | STEPH. LANGTON      | 1216        | HEN. III.        |

Constitutiones factae in ecclesia SS. Petri et Pauli Novae Villae iuxta Athrumiam per Simonem Dei gratia Episcopum Midensem in synodo ibidem tenta anno MCCXVI.—(*Ex MS. penes Joan. ep. Clogher.*)

Cum dominus Johannes Paparo presbyter cardinalis tituli S. Laurenti in Damaso, summi Pontificis et domini nostri Eugenii III legatus in Hibernia, in synodo generali tenta apud Kenanas <sup>2</sup> in Midia anno gratiae

<sup>1</sup> I. E. RECORD, vol. vi. p. 82, 'Among the Graves.'

<sup>2</sup> The Irish name of Kells.



MCLII, inter alias salubres constitutiones tunc et ibidem factas, ordinaverit ut, decedentibus chorepiscopis<sup>1</sup> et exiliorum<sup>2</sup> sedium episcopis in Hibernia, in eorum locum eligentur et succederent archipresbyteri a diocesanis constituendi, qui cleri et plebis sollicitudinem gerant infra suos limites, et ut eorum sedes in totidem capita decanatum ruralium erigerentur; idcirco nos, Episcopus antedictus,<sup>3</sup> eius ordinationi morem gerentes,<sup>4</sup> statuimus et ordinamus prout sequitur :

I. Imprimis ut in ecclesia Athrumensi, Kenanusensi, Slanensi, Skrynsensi, Donnachsacheling,<sup>5</sup> olim sedibus episcopalibus in Midia, nunc vero capitibus ruralium decanatum, archipresbyteri de futuro instituendi, non solum perpetuam et personalem residentiam faciant in iisdem ecclesiis, verum etiam cleri et populi infra limites eorum decanatum sollicitudinem gerant.

II. Ut nullus in archipresbyterium ordinetur nisi qui presbyter sit, sub poena amotionis a suo officio.

III. Item, quod vacante per mortem aut alio quovismodo archipresbyteratus officio, eligendus est per nos aut successores nostras successor, quia iurisdictionem suam a nobis haurit.

IV. Item ut archipresbyteri quotannis, et saepius si opus fuerit, personaliter visitent statum et conditionem omnium ecclesiarum infra suos decanatus; et si qua ecclesia reparatione indigeat, hortentur gregem dominicum ad eorum reparationem, actaque visitationis ad nos in proxima synodo transmitti curent. Videant etiam an domus pastorum et capellanorum sint sartae tectae; \* corruptelas morum in populo reformare studeant, et si quas abstergere nequeant, ad synodam diocesanam referant, ut de iis emendandis cum consilio cleri deliberari possit.

V. Item, ut procurent fidele transcriptum ad nos in synodo transmitti de statu et conditione librorum, vasorum, vestimentorum, et aliorum ornamentorum et suppellectilium in ecclesiis infra suos decanatus, ut de iis reficiendis, quoties expedit, statuamus.

VI. Curent insuper poenitentias canonicas, a nobis vel officialibus nostris impositas delinquentibus, debite et ea, qua decet, solemnitate peragi et perimpleri in ecclesiis infra suos limites, quibus ipsi cum presbyteris parochialibus intersint tamquam testes, ut qua humilitate et devotione poenitentiae laboribus defuncti sunt testificare possint.

VII. Item, ut in admissione ad officium iuramentum praestent de fidei executione sui officii. Item, de inquirendo et praestando nobis et officialibus nostris nomina et cognomina omnium et singulorum, infra suos decanatus, qui publice et notorie defamati, aut vehementer suspecti sunt de aliquo crimine aut infamia, per auctoritatem nostram puniendi[orum] et corrigend[orum].

VIII. Item, ut capitula ruralia diligenter convocari faciant per se aut per suos nuncios in praecipuis locis decanatum, de tribus septimanis in tres tenenda, et aliquando extraordinarie ad voluntatem nostram, si nobis visum fuerit aliquid in istis conventibus cum clero communicare. "

<sup>1</sup> Bishops without territorial sees.

<sup>2</sup> 'Exiliorum' must be a blunder for 'exilium' = 'small.'

<sup>3</sup> Simon de Rochefort.

<sup>4</sup> 'Conforming unto' or 'obedient unto.'

<sup>5</sup> The Irish form of Dunshaughlin.

<sup>6</sup> 'Buildings in good repair.'

IX. In his capitulis ipsi praesint ut moderentur tractatus cleri de communibus negotiis decanatum; in iisdem etiam faciant inquisitiones fieri de beneficiis vacantibus, et de intrusis vi laica in beneficia. Curent insuper transcriptum fieri statutorum provincialium et diocesanorum, eaque in singulis capitulis post proximas synodos recitari faciant, et exponi clero infra suos limites, ne quis peccet in eadem per aliquem pretextum ignorantiae; admoneant etiam curatores animarum ut populo infra suas parochias publicari faciant et exponi eas constitutiones quae ad plebem spectant et pertinent.

X. Prohibemus archipresbyteris probationem testamentorum, tractationem causarum matrimonialium, causas simoniae, et omnes causas criminales quae deprivationem cleri et amissionem beneficiorum exigunt.

XI. Praeterea decanis ruralibus distinctius inhibemus ne in suos subjectos exactiones vel talias per se vel per suos exercere praesumant.

XII. Quodsi in praemissis negligentes aut remissi aut inobedientes fuerint, et de hoc constare poterit per testes fide dignos, a nobis aut successoribus nostris ab officio suo suspendantur donec mores emendaverint.

P. CALLARY.



# NOTES AND QUERIES

## THEOLOGY

### THE LAW OF FAST—IRISH INDULT

REV. DEAR SIR,—Is it not wrong to state, as the *Ordo* does (p. vi., *English Directory*, p. xxvii.), that meat is allowed on those vigils which ‘immediately precede Fridays’? When the Assumption, All Saints, or Christmas falls on Friday, the vigil is abstinence as well as fast. The wording in Messrs. Browne and Nolan’s *Catechism Notes* appears to be more correct: ‘In Ireland there is permission to take meat on the second of two consecutive abstinence days, except during Lent.’ They might have inserted ‘at the principal meal.’

M.

A discussion on tastes is proverbially useless. The *Ordo* and the *Catechism Notes* are both, each in its own way, quite correct. An Indult was granted to Scotland on the 27th January, 1911, and extended to Ireland on the 31st July, 1912.<sup>1</sup> The *Ordo* quotes the exact words of the original, and gives the concession as it stands—independent of other laws that have been, or may be, passed on Fasts and Feasts in general: the *Notes* combines the Indult with other laws and gives the result in a popular form that, for the time being, is correct and practical. ‘M.’ inclines to the second method: the first man he meets may favour the other; and a discussion on the point will probably leave them both where they started.

When the Scotch Bishops presented their petition, there was no mention of the ‘second’ of two successive days of abstinence; only mention of ‘one’ of them. If the days were Thursday and Friday, we presume that the intention was to exempt the first, not the second. Anyhow, this is the reply that came:—

De Omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum ejus auctoritate confisi, omnibus ac singulis Scotiae Regni fidelibus Apostolica Auctoritate Nostra praesentium tenore perpetuo concedimus et largimur, ut, Quadragesima exclusa, in Sabbatis quatuor anni temporum, *et in iis vigiliis, quae vel feriam sextam vel alium abstinentioniae diem immediate praecedant aut sequantur*, carnibus vesci libere liciteque possint ac valeant.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ‘M.’ will find the documents quoted in the (Latin) *Ordo* for 1913, pp. xxvii., xxviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Italics ours.*

The Irish petition—which was granted—took this form :—

Hiberniae Antistites in annuo conventu congregati ad pedes S.V. provoluti humiliter supplicant ut extendatur ad Hiberniam indultum elapso anno concessum Scotiae Episcopis per apostolicum breve die 27 Januarii 1911, quo Scotiae fidelibus usus carnum permittebatur *in uno ex duobus diebus abstinentiae continuis*, quamvis lege communi talis usus prohibeatur, semper tamen exclusa Quadragesima.<sup>1</sup>

If the Scotch Indult had been at once extended to Ireland, the law of abstinence would have been relaxed on the Saturdays of Quarter Tense outside Lent, on the Saturday preceding Pentecost Sunday, and on the vigils of Christmas, SS. Peter and Paul, the Assumption, and All Saints, when any of the four fell on a Thursday or a Saturday.<sup>2</sup> Before it was extended, however, another law had come into force. In the *Motu proprio* of July 2, 1911, Pope Pius X dispensed in fast and abstinence whenever a day, otherwise subject to these laws, fell on a Feast of Precept.<sup>3</sup> The consequence was that when any of the Feasts whose vigils we have mentioned fell on a Friday, the previous day of abstinence (Thursday) stood alone, and the Indult did not apply<sup>4</sup>: the conditions specified in the concession were not fulfilled, because, in the new circumstances, the vigil did *not* 'precede a Friday (or other day) of abstinence.' Except that the 28th June is now exempt in all cases (1252, § 2), the regulation is confirmed by the Code (1252, § 4).<sup>5</sup> So that, combining *both* laws, we may sum up the situation in the words of the *Catechism Notes*: 'In Ireland there is permission to take meat on the *second* of two consecutive abstinence days, except during Lent.'

But, all the same, we think it just as well to record the original words of the Indult. The law regarding Feasts has had a varied career during the last ten years, and we should be cautious about assuming that it has reached its final form. Corpus Christi was transferred from Thursday to Sunday,<sup>6</sup> re-transferred from Sunday to Thursday, but freed from the precept of attending Mass, etc.,<sup>7</sup> left on the Thursday but with precept restored.<sup>8</sup> The Feast of St. Joseph was transferred to the following Sunday,<sup>9</sup> re-transferred to the 19th without precept,<sup>10</sup> left on the 19th with precept restored<sup>11</sup>: raised, we may add, to the level of a double

<sup>1</sup> Italics ours.

<sup>2</sup> Since Christmas Day was not a day of abstinence, Thursday, 24th December, might seem to be an exception. But the previous day (Wednesday) was then a day of abstinence (and fast) in this country: so the Thursday, after all, was freed by the Indult.

<sup>3</sup> No. V.; vide I. E. RECORD, September, 1911, pp. 329-30.

<sup>4</sup> Except on Thursday, 24th December, as indicated in previous note.

<sup>5</sup> The Lenten regulation of the canon does not concern us now. But the 'nec pervigilia anticipantur' may be noted. It freed us from fast and abstinence on the 30th October last: the Indult would have removed the abstinence.

<sup>6</sup> 2nd July, 1911; I. E. RECORD, *ibid.*, p. 329.

<sup>7</sup> 24th July, 1911; *ibid.*, p. 331.

<sup>8</sup> Code (1247, § 1).

<sup>9</sup> 2nd July, 1911; *ibid.*, p. 329.

<sup>10</sup> 24th July, 1911; *ibid.*, p. 331.

<sup>11</sup> Code (1247, § 1): it does not affect Ireland.



of the first class,<sup>1</sup> lowered to the second class,<sup>2</sup> raised again to the first.<sup>3</sup> In Ireland, the Feast of St. Patrick was freed from precept,<sup>4</sup> subjected to it again,<sup>5</sup> freed once more,<sup>6</sup> and finally re-subjected.<sup>7</sup> We do not anticipate that any of the four Feasts, whose vigils have been occupying our attention, will have a similar experience. But, judging by the past, we can never be quite certain. If the worst comes to pass, we can fall back on the original words of the Indult and adapt our 'perpetual' concession to the modified order of things.

They might (adds 'M') have inserted 'at the principal meal.' But then they would have to explain that the phrase applies only to those who are bound by the law of fast; others may avail of the concession *toties quoties*.

#### WHEN DOES THE CHURCH SUPPLY JURISDICTION?

REV. DEAR SIR,—At a conference recently the discussion turned on the present state of the law in regard to the Church's supplying jurisdiction. I had not realized that so many different views could be held on a matter that, at first sight, seems simple enough. One disputant, a strong advocate of liberty, claimed that everything is right when the confessor and penitent are both *bona fide*: and for that he quoted several canons of the Codex, No. 209 especially. Between that view and the opinion of a few, who could see no change effected by the Codex, nearly every possible view found advocates. Would you help us by saying:—

1°. What change, if any, has been introduced in regard to 'common error';

2°. To what extent has the law been modified respecting doubts of law and of fact;

3°. Whether our disputant's claim in favour of *bona fides* has any foundation.

DUBIUS.

The disputant specially mentioned by 'Dubius' undoubtedly pushed matters to extremes. But we suspect that, like so many others nowadays, he adopted the revolutionary attitude only under the influence of grave provocation.

For it must have been rather trying to discuss the matter with men who could find 'no change effected' by recent legislation. Not that they were altogether without excuse: some of the commentators are such admirers of the past that they cling to an ancient theory even when the law has signed its death-warrant.<sup>8</sup> But even a superficial

<sup>1</sup> 24th July, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> Congregation of Rites (28th October, 1913).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. (12th December, 1917).

<sup>4</sup> 2nd July, 1911.

<sup>5</sup> 21st November, 1911; I. E. RECORD, January, 1912, p. 96.

<sup>6</sup> 1247, § 2.

<sup>7</sup> 13th May, 1919; I. E. RECORD, July, 1919, p. 62.

<sup>8</sup> Cf., in this very connexion, the emphasis is laid on 'coloured title' in Father Augustine's *Commentary on Canon Law*, ii. p. 190: 'Of course, the common error, to have this effect, must be accompanied by a *titulus coloratus*.'

reading of the Code would show them their mistake. There used to be, for instance, a theoretical difference of view as to whether a 'simple priest' could absolve in case of danger of death, when a fully-qualified confessor was actually on the scene. That controversy has been laid to rest by the explicit terms of Canon 882. Again, the law itself supplies jurisdiction in many of the episcopally-reserved cases that used to give so much trouble in the past (899, § 3), and it raises the ordinary confessor to a much higher position than he ever occupied before, even when the reservation is Papal (900). To follow the disputant a little way along his '*bona fides*' lines, we need only recall a few canons that we are sure he fully utilized. A confessor, who acts through inadvertence, gives a valid absolution, even though the time has expired or though the number of cases has been exhausted (207, § 2). When there is question of censures not inflicted *ab homine* or not reserved in a very special manner to the Holy See, a valid absolution may be given by a confessor who is not aware of the fact that he has got no special faculties (2247, § 3). Apart (again) from censures very specially reserved to the Holy See, a *bona fide* penitent who fails to state all the censures he has incurred will be freed from all by a general absolution (2249, § 2). And, to return to the main principle, the disputant was quite right in laying special emphasis on Canon 209: it marks a distinct advance, and is of wider application than all the rest combined.

But that does not mean that 'good faith' smoothes out all difficulties—and we doubt very much whether the disputant ever meant to be taken seriously. The prospect of theology-made-easy has its attractive points: but it puts a premium on ignorance and carelessness, and is out of harmony with all the scientific principles ever enunciated by theologians or re-affirmed by the Code. The canons we have cited make liberal allowance for very special cases, and the spiritual welfare of the penitent is allowed in these cases to outweigh the advantages of strict consistency. But the exceptions only prove the rule: the very care exhibited in marking off these special instances is the best indication that, outside these limits, the ordinary rules must be applied. Good faith is no substitute for jurisdiction.

Coming to the special queries:—

1°. In connexion with 'common error' the new law has made a change, but only in the sense that common error by itself is now followed by the same consequences as used to result from 'common error' combined with 'coloured title.' The expression itself means exactly what it meant before—a general misapprehension regarding the confessor's faculties. As the words imply, the misapprehension need not be universal: correct knowledge on the part of a very few would not prevent our regarding the misapprehension as general. Nor, in the case of a confessor for instance, is it the opinion merely of the penitents that has to be taken into account: the decisive test is the opinion of the whole community, whether the members act on their erroneous assumption or not. So far all are agreed. When a few authorities go further still—claiming that the conditions are verified when, though



there is no 'actual' error, the circumstances are such that error would be the natural result—we must say we find it difficult to follow. They seem to be taking words in a sense they were never intended to convey. The texts imply a *de facto* error, not one merely *de jure*: it is to protect innocent people from the consequences of the unfounded opinions they actually hold that the Church sanctions the departure from strict scientific accuracy. If, even through some accidental circumstance, they are enabled to discard the false impressions they would otherwise entertain, the purpose of the liberal rule has ceased, and there is no need to protect them any longer.<sup>1</sup>

Examples of 'common error' are easily imagined. A parish priest, for instance, is absent for a considerable time and appoints an outsider to take his place. Whether through inadvertence or carelessness or some other cause, the latter enters on the work without securing faculties from the local Ordinary. A few well-informed individuals may suspect, or even know, the true state of affairs, but the parishioners, as a body, never dream that there is anything wrong. Confessions are heard as usual, and in every case the absolution is valid.

But, we think, not always lawful. For it has always been felt, and must still be maintained, that, unless when there is a proportionately justifying cause, no one is allowed to force the Church into supplying jurisdiction in circumstances for which she cannot be held in any sense responsible. She is not responsible for 'common error'—unless it arises from a 'probability of law'—and the man who acts, with no better title to support him, is usurping a power that he knows perfectly well is not his habitually.<sup>2</sup> In the example just given, the parish priest's substitute would be justified in hearing confessions when the penitents are already in the church and cannot be dismissed without serious inconvenience to themselves and possibly without danger of scandal. But he ought to set matters right, if possible, before a similar crisis can occur again.

2°. The canon tells us that 'in case of positive and probable doubt whether of law or of fact, the Church supplies jurisdiction' (209). So far as doubts of law are concerned, this implies no change, except that a conclusion morally certain in pre-Code days is now elevated into a text of law. But, as regards doubts of fact, the change is considerable. The common teaching<sup>3</sup> used to be that in such cases the jurisdiction remained doubtful, in spite of all reflex principles; that a confessor should not act except there was pressing necessity—e.g., the penitent had to fulfil the Paschal precept, or to celebrate as a matter of obligation, or could abstain from receiving Communion only at the risk of his reputation; that, finally, the absolution given, even in these cases,

<sup>1</sup> But others take a different view. The more liberal opinion, they say, 'omnino secure admitti potest' (Sabetti-Barrett, n. 770, q. 12°).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lehmkuhl, ii. 506. He bases his view on (1) usurpation, (2) danger to the penitent. The second consideration does not hold under the Code.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lehmkuhl, *ibid*.

remained doubtful, and did not *per se* exempt the penitent from a second confession later on. All that is now obsolete. The Church certainly supplies. When the doubt is one of law, the lawfulness of action will depend on the reflex principles—of Probabilism, Equiprobabilism, etc.—applicable in other matters of mere liceity. When one of fact, somewhat greater caution is necessary; for, though there is not the same certainty of usurpation as in the case of ‘common error,’ still the Church can hardly be held responsible for the state of indecision of which she is willing, in a crisis, to avert the consequences.<sup>1</sup>

But in both cases a condition is required. The doubt must be ‘positive,’ i.e., there must be definite reasons for holding that jurisdiction has been given: it must be also ‘probable,’ i.e., the reasons, considered objectively, must be strong enough to establish, not merely a ‘slender,’ but a ‘solid’ probability in favour of the jurisdiction.

We say ‘considered objectively,’ for there must be evidence enough, intrinsic or extrinsic, to appeal to the normally-gifted and normally-educated confessor: else there would be no more effective way of securing jurisdiction than by forgetting to learn, or by learning to forget, all the principles and conclusions of Moral Theology and common sense. The distinction between ‘slender’ and ‘solid’ probability has had so much attention directed to it in the discussions on Probabilism, and in the Papal condemnations of the laxer views, that a discussion on the theory of the matter would be superfluous. A few examples will indicate the standard. There was a solid probability ‘of law,’ in pre-Code times, in favour of a simple priest’s power to absolve a dying penitent even when a fully qualified confessor was present. There is a similar probability now that a priest may always absolve when his jurisdiction expires during the confession, that a nun may be absolved by any generally-commissioned confessor in the sacristy of the convent oratory, that ignorance of simple reservation excuses when the Superior knows that the principle is freely taught and takes no steps to counteract it, etc., etc. On doubts ‘of fact,’ prudence and common sense must be the guide. A priest, who cannot just now consult his papers, will give a valid absolution when he finds that reliable men are acting without scruple on the same commission as he has got himself; or when he knows that a good case can be made out in favour of his jurisdiction—even though a stronger case may be made out against it. If, on the other hand, he was appointed to conduct a mission (say) from May 15th to June 15th, and if it was the Bishop’s practice to confine faculties to the mission period, his absolution on June 20th would remain doubtful, even though he could not say for certain whether it was ‘June’ or ‘July’ that was mentioned in the document—unless, again, ‘common error’ came to the rescue.

3°. On ‘good faith’ as a basis of action we have said enough already.

<sup>1</sup> But cf. again, Sabetti-Barrett, n. 773. q. 3°: ‘An liceat absolvere in dubio positivo et probabili, sive juris sive facti? *Afirm., quia Ecclesia supplet, etc.*’



## SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—On a visit recently to Ireland I was much impressed by the free and joyful character of Catholicity, as contrasted with the gloom of some of the ‘reformed’ Churches. I refer especially to Sunday observance. I found pleasant social parties, athletic games, Sunday excursions—and many other things that would have caused no little surprise in the circles I had left. . . . I admit there is nothing wrong in principle, but are there not serious abuses? And, even though there were not, would it not be advisable to make some concessions to those who were brought up in a different atmosphere and who cannot help being repelled by what they consider the irreverence shown to the day specially set apart by the Almighty for Himself? The policy would seem to be quite in the spirit of the Apostle who declared he would never eat meat if it scandalized his brethren. . . . I am not suggesting, as I said, any sacrifice of principle: only a reasonable, and, of course, legitimate accommodation to the ingrained convictions of serious inquirers. . . .

[Extract from a long document.]

EXSUL.

We are glad to find that ‘Exsul’ can discover some traces of joy in Ireland still. Where they exist at all they must certainly be due to ‘the free and joyful character of Catholicity’: there is very little else to account for them. But, with the best intentions in the world, ‘Exsul’ is apparently bent upon depriving us of the little we have left.

Where assertion of principle should stop and accommodation begin is a bigger subject than we could hope to deal with in a brief reply. But our course is clear enough when the scandal taken is purely Pharisaical, or when the policy proposed would entail serious perils to the Christian faith, or when accommodation might be easily taken as a recognition of the claim that we are still subjected to the disciplinary rigour of the Jewish code. If Scripture be quoted against us, we have only to say that the Apostle who would never eat meat if it scandalized his brother<sup>1</sup> was the very same Apostle who, in protest against accommodation on that very matter, resisted Peter to the face and gloried in the fact.<sup>2</sup>

The scandal is Pharisaical. About that we need have little doubt. As a blind protest against Catholic practice—perhaps as an unconscious, but misguided, act of restitution for dogmas sacrificed—the Calvinistic observance was established in defiance of consistency and principle. The men who profess to take offence *have* principles; they reject the authority of the Catholic Church and proclaim the Bible the sole rule of faith. But where in the Bible do they find any warrant for their gloomy observance—or for any observance of Sunday at all? If they attended only to the Bible, they should be very careful about leaving their houses or their churches on Saturday, but should treat Sunday like any other weekday. They are not satisfied with that; they will sacrifice their principles and follow the Catholic Church. But always with a proviso—‘in the main matter, not in details.’ They will accept the Church’s abolition of the Sabbath and her establishment of a Christian feast, but they

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. ii. 11.

refuse to listen when she tells them how the feast established by herself is to be observed and understood. With the Church and St. Paul, they claim exemption from the Jewish yoke ; but, to form a shrine for the Catholic gift, they gather up the battered relics of an outworn law. And, having discarded their principles, they profess to take offence when others refuse to follow the example. That is surely Pharisaical scandal. They cannot have it both ways. If the Church is strong enough to give them a new feast, she is strong enough to tell them how to keep it. And her standard is neither indefinite nor Pharisaical : ‘Festis de praecepto diebus Missa audienda est : et abstinendum ab operibus servilibus, actis forensibus, itemque, nisi aliud ferant legitimæ consuetudines aut peculiaria indulta, publico mercatu, nundinis, aliisque publicis emptionibus et venditionibus.’<sup>1</sup>

That the accommodation may give colour to the claim that we are still subject to Jewish discipline, we may leave the chapter already cited from the *Galatians* to establish. How it may involve danger to the faith, we prefer to let a convert explain<sup>2</sup> :—

In the early nineteenth century Evangelicalism—especially that terrible variety, Calvinism—was the dominant factor [in England] wherever religion really prevailed as a living influence ; and it is to its influence, I firmly believe, that we may attribute the genuine detestation of religion that was so marked a feature of a part of the Victorian and most of the succeeding time. . . . Of this creed I can speak from personal knowledge, for I was brought up in it and know it from bitter experience.<sup>3</sup>

After putting on record some of ‘the most distorted and distorting ideas of what was and what was not sin ever conceived by any brain—in connexion with card-playing, dances, theatre-going, literary authorship,’ etc.—he continues :

The idea of God which was presented to the youth of that period and brought up under such influences was—I do not say wilfully—that of a kind of super-policeman : a hard-hearted policeman, with an exaggerated code of misdoings, for ever waiting round a corner to pounce on evil-doers, and, one was obliged to think, apparently almost pleased at the opportunity of catching them. . . . Add to this the terrors of the exaggerated Sabbatarianism of the period. What was the Sunday programme ? Two lengthy sessions of Family Prayers ; two attendances—each lasting at least an hour and a quarter—on services in church ; one, sometimes two, hours of Sunday School ; no books but those of a religious character ; no amusement of any kind, even for the very young, unless the putting together of a dissected map of Palestine could be called an amusement. . . . Is it any wonder that those brought up on such a plan abandoned, with a sigh of relief, all religious exercises when at last they were able to do so ?<sup>4</sup>

He quotes Mr. Belfort Bax to the effect that ‘the most cruel of all the results of mid-Victorian religion was, perhaps, the rigid enforcement of the most drastic Sabbatarianism,’ cites two literary instances, and

<sup>1</sup> Code (1248).

<sup>2</sup> *Science and Morals* (Sir Bertram Windle), pp. 32 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 32, 33.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 36, 37.



regrets that the teachers of such 'religion' cannot study 'some simple manual of Catholic ethics, from which they would learn the ideal doctrine of Christianity, and would discover how very different a thing it is and how very much more reasonable than the distorted caricature which we have been studying.'<sup>1</sup>

The extracts remind us of a remark by the director of a recent clerical retreat. Though he was brought up in an atmosphere strongly tainted by Calvinist surroundings, his spirituality and humour had emerged victorious. But only after much trial and hardships. On many a Sunday in his early life he had wondered 'if this is the Lord's *day*, what must the Lord's *place* be like?'

This is the spirit to which 'Exsul' wants us to make concessions. He is perfectly sincere we have no doubt, but his efforts would be better employed in other directions. Pharisees are very contemptible. The men who are horrified at the Catholic Church's treatment of the Bible have turned against the Bible and left the Catholic Church alone to defend it. They denounce her Middle-Age holidays, but, in response to a need that she was the first to recognize, have established more holidays and half-holidays than she ever sanctioned. They attack our Sunday worship, but, as the witnesses state, drive their own people into observing no Sunday at all. Their methods are wrong and misguided, and concessions would do more harm than good.

'Exsul' speaks of abuses. When he has cited even one institution on earth that has not been often abused, and is not liable to abuse at all times, we may discuss the matter with better prospect of an understanding. He has brought us views from 'the circles he left'; he will not take offence if we present him and them with some of our own in return.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

## CANON LAW

### CERTAIN POWERS OF BISHOPS IN REGARD TO THE DISPENSATION FROM THE LAWS OF PROVINCIAL AND NATIONAL COUNCILS, THE FIXING OF THE TAX FOR MANUAL MASSES, AND THE ABSOLUTION FROM THE EXCOMMUNICATION ATTACHED TO THE CRIMES OF APOSTASY, HERESY, AND SCHISM

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly reply to the following queries in the I. E. RECORD:—

1°. Can a Bishop grant general delegation to dispense from the laws of Provincial and Plenary or National Councils? Does Canon 291, § 2, limit his power in this matter?

2°. Can a Bishop alter, outside the Diocesan Synod, the scale of *honoraria* previously fixed in the Synod? The altered value of money demands some change.

8°. Can a Bishop grant general delegation to receive the juridical

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 37-44.

abjuration of those who have incurred the excommunication attached to heresy in accordance with Canon 2814, § 2? Can he also grant general faculties to absolve from the excommunication *abjuratiōe juridice perfecta*? What is the exact restriction on the Vicar-General?

CLERICUS.

1°. Canon 291, § 2, declares that Ordinaries cannot dispense from the laws of Plenary and Provincial Councils, except in particular cases and for a just cause. Hence, in virtue of this canon, Bishops and other Ordinaries have the power of dispensing from these laws in particular cases and for a just cause. This power pertains, therefore, to ordinary jurisdiction, in accordance with the definition given in Canon 197, § 1, and so, in virtue of Canon 199, § 1, can be delegated generally. Of course it must be understood that Bishops and other Ordinaries cannot grant to others greater power than they possess themselves, and hence they can give to others general or habitual faculties merely to dispense in particular cases and for a just cause.

2°. Canon 831, § 1, states that it is the right of the local Ordinary to fix by a decree the stipend for Masses in his diocese, and that, as far as possible, the decree should be issued in the diocesan Synod. A Bishop or other local Ordinary, therefore, can always validly fix the stipend outside the diocesan Synod—this, of course, includes changing a stipend previously fixed. The words *quantum fieri potest, in diocesana Synodo latum*, however, imply that for lawfulness the tax should be settled in the diocesan Synod, unless urgency or some similar reason renders this procedure inconvenient, in which case a Bishop may legitimately act outside the Synod. Nor does the fact that the previous tax has been approved by the Synod restrict the Bishop's power: synodal decrees have their binding force entirely from the Bishop's authority.

In a case regarding manual Masses dealt with in the Congregation of Council in 1918, this very point came up for decision. One paragraph in the official discussion bears so closely on the present query that we shall quote it:—

Nor, if the synodal tax was approved in the Synod, is the Bishop, therefore, without power to change it by a new decree. For decrees of a diocesan Synod are changeable, just as other laws; and since those decrees have their force and efficacy solely and entirely from the authority and jurisdiction of the Bishop, which is quite the same, whether it is exercised in the Synod or outside of the Synod (Benedict XVI, *De Syn. dioec.*, lib. xiii., cap. 5), the Bishop can, therefore, by his decree, constitute a new tax, having revoked the old one; and, just as the decrees of the Synod are promulgated after consultation with the Cathedral Chapter, so, for the promulgation of this episcopal decree, it is advisable to obtain the advice of the Chapter beforehand, although this is not required in strict law.<sup>1</sup>

3°. Canon 2814, § 2, is concerned with the absolution of the excommunication attached to the crimes of apostasy, heresy, and schism. In the forum of conscience the absolution is specially reserved to the Holy

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. x. p. 373.



See. If the crimes, however, are brought in any way whatever, even by voluntary confession, to the external forum of the local Ordinary, he can, in virtue of his ordinary jurisdiction, absolve the delinquent in the external forum after the latter has made a juridical abjuration. A person thus absolved in the external forum can then receive absolution from the sin in the forum of conscience from any approved confessor. The abjuration is regarded as having been made juridically when it takes place before the local Ordinary or his delegate and at least two witnesses. Although, generally speaking, the Vicar-General is included in the term 'local Ordinary,' in this connexion it is pointed out that he is not, unless he receives a special mandate.

Since it is expressly stated that the jurisdiction by which the Bishop or other local Ordinary absolves from the excommunication in the external forum is ordinary (*ordinaria sua auctoritate*), it follows, in accordance with Canon 199, § 1, that it can be delegated generally. Although there is no express statement to that effect, it is quite clear from the canon that the power of the Bishop to receive the abjuration is also ordinary, and hence it, too, may be delegated generally. The precise restriction on the Vicar-General is that he cannot absolve or receive juridical abjuration in virtue of the ordinary mandate by which he is appointed Vicar-General : for this purpose a special mandate or its equivalent is required. Mention of this power in the general mandate is quite sufficient. It must be remembered that the power which a Vicar-General receives by special mandate is not merely delegated ; it is of the same nature as that acquired by the general mandate, and consequently follows the same rules in regard to delegation.

#### THE PLACE IN WHICH TEMPORARY PROFESSION SHOULD BE MADE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Canon 574, § 1, states that 'In every Order, both of men and women, and in every Congregation with perpetual vows, the perpetual vows, whether solemn or simple, must be preceded, saving the exception provided for in Canon 634, by the profession of simple vows which the novice, on the completion of his novitiate, shall make in the novitiate house itself ; this profession is valid for three years, or for a longer period if the subject requires more than three years to attain the age prescribed for perpetual profession, unless the constitutions require annual professions.'

Would you be good enough to say, in the I. E. RECORD, whether this section requires that the period for which temporary vows are taken must be spent in the novitiate house, or is the implication merely that the act of profession itself must be made there ?

RELIGIOSUS.

When obscure points in the Code have to be elucidated it is always of importance to refer to the Latin form of the canon in question, since it alone has full authorization. Although, in the present case, the original text does not throw much light on the authentic English translation, which our correspondent has quoted, yet, on scientific grounds, we shall

give the pertinent portion of it : ' Novitius post expletum novitiatum, in ipsa novitiatu domo debet votis perpetuis . . . *praemittere*, salvo praescripto Can. 634, votorum simplicium professionem ad triennium valituram, vel ad longius tempus, si aetas ad perpetuam professionem requisita longius distet.'

We are of opinion that this section prescribes merely that the act of temporary profession should be made in the novitiate house, and that it has nothing whatever to say as to the place in which the period of temporary profession is to be spent : this is the natural implication of the words *praemittere professionem*. That *praemittere professionem* refers only to the act of profession is evident also from a comparison with the two or three canons which immediately precede and follow Canon 574. In these the words *emittere professionem* have, without any doubt whatever, this restricted signification ; and the prefix *prae* in *praemittere* merely expresses the temporal relation between the perpetual and temporary profession.

The same conclusion may be deduced from Canon 564, § 1. This paragraph prescribes that ' the novitiate house shall be, as far as possible, separated from that part of the house inhabited by the professed religious, so that, without a special cause and the permission of the Superior or of the Master, the novices may not have communication with the professed religious, nor these latter with the novices.' Now, if Canon 574 requires that those who are temporarily professed should remain in the novitiate house during the period of temporary profession, and so contains an exception to the general rule given in Canon 564, it is very strange that there is no reference to the exception in the latter : the very fact that there is not is a strong indication that exception does not really exist. It should not, therefore, be admitted without a clear statement, and certainly the words *praemittere professionem*, etc., do not fulfil this condition.

The fact that the old discipline required in somewhat similar circumstances that profession should be made in the novitiate house constitutes a further argument in favour of the interpretation which we have been advocating. The following query and reply, published by the Congregation on the State of Regulars, in December, 1859, illustrates pretty well the pre-Code position in the matter :—

According to the Constitution of Clement VIII, profession of solemn vows should be made in the Convent of the Novitiate. In virtue of the law made on the 19th March, 1857, those who have made profession of simple vows should remain in houses for the Professed and in houses of Studies. Hence it is asked whether professed with simple vows, in order that they may be admitted in their proper time to the profession of solemn vows, should be transferred to the Convent of the Novitiate ; or can they make it in the convent in which they are residing ?

His Holiness, in an audience granted on the 9th December, 1859, to the undermentioned Secretary of the Sacred Congregation on the State of Regulars, in view of the law on the taking of simple vows made on the 19th March, 1857, decrees and orders that, notwithstanding the Apostolic



Letters of Clement VIII, and everything else to the contrary, professed with simple vows, can, in their proper time, lawfully and freely make profession of solemn vows in the Convent or House in which they are, without being bound to make their profession in the house in which the novitiate was passed.'<sup>1</sup>

Of the commentaries which we have read, that of Führich is the only one which refers to this point : it confirms our interpretation. 'A definite place,' it states, 'is prescribed for the first profession only, namely, the novitiate house. Subsequent profession, whether it is solemn or simple, perpetual or mere renewal of temporary profession, can be made elsewhere also.'<sup>2</sup>

#### THE MEANING OF 'LINGUA PATRIA' IN CANON 1364, n. 2

REV. DEAR SIR,—In the next issue of the I. E. RECORD, please state whether Canon 1364, n. 2, commands all students, lay and clerical, to acquire an accurate knowledge of the Irish language.

CURIOSITAS.

The following is the section of Canon 1364, to which our correspondent refers : 'In inferioribus Seminarii scholis : 2° Linguas praesertim latinam et patriam alumni accurate addiscant.'

Now, it is quite clear from the text and the context that the *alumni*, of whom there is question here, are students intended for the clerical state. In the language of Canon Law a seminary is a school for the training of those who intend to devote themselves to the sacred ministry. Most of our Irish diocesan seminaries, it is true, contain many lay students also, but this is an extraordinary condition, and affords no justification for extending the meaning of *alumni*. The context, too, makes it clear that this whole title on Seminaries is concerned with clerical students only : the very first canon in the title, 1354, which asserts the Church's exclusive right to train those who desire to devote themselves to the sacred ministry, strikes the keynote. The conditions which Canon Law requires to be observed in the education of lay students are contained in the title 'On Schools.'

This regulation, then, affects only clerical students : it prescribes the study of languages, especially Latin and the vernacular, in the lower classes in the seminary. The question to be determined is the meaning of *lingua patria* for us. Does it necessarily mean the Irish language ? We consider that it does not. The expression *lingua patria*, taken by itself, is, we think, ambiguous : it may mean either the language actually in common use in any particular place or country, or it may mean the native language, from the historical standpoint. We must therefore determine, from extrinsic considerations, which of these meanings must be attached to it here. Now, when the words of a law are doubtful, the motive is of the utmost importance in arriving at its true interpretation. In the present case the motive of the law is to secure that those who

<sup>1</sup> Vermeersch, *Monumenta*, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> *De Religiosis*, p. 163, § 93, 1°.

intend to join the ecclesiastical state should become efficient ministers of the Gospel, and for this purpose it is practically essential that they should have a thorough grounding in the language commonly used in the place in which their ministry lies ; whereas knowledge of the language which is that of the country merely historically has very little influence on their missionary efficiency. We conclude, therefore, that *lingua patria* in this canon is equivalent to the language in common use in a place or country, and hence for our Irish seminaries, at the present time, it means the English language. Of course, if a portion of the people in any diocese speak Irish only, the Bishop is bound, by the natural law itself, to provide them with Irish-speaking priests, and this can be effectively done only if he obliges his students, or at least some of them, to study the language in the seminaries.

### THE EFFECT OF THE CLAUSE 'MOTU PROPRIO' ON RESCRIPTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—The question of rescripts and the changes wrought in the old discipline by the Code were discussed recently at a certain clerical conference. As you might expect, there was uncertainty and difference of opinion in regard to many points, and amongst others in regard to Canons 45 and 46. The general impression seemed to be that those were merely a summing-up of the pre-Code legislation. I have since consulted the few works at my disposal, but they have thrown very little light on the matter. I should be grateful if you would discuss the relations between these canons and the pre-Code discipline in the I. E. RECORD.

SACERDOS.

The legislation of the Decretals in regard to the effect of the clause *Motu proprio* on rescripts is not very precise or detailed. The most important dispositions are contained in the chapters *Si motu proprio*, 23, de Praeb. in 6,<sup>1</sup> and *Si Romanus*, 4, de Praeb. Clem.<sup>2</sup>: they simply declare that the concession of a benefice by the Pope with this clause is valid even though in the petition there is no mention of the fact that the petitioner was already in possession of another benefice. It is only in the great commentators that we find the decretal teaching generalized and scientifically set forth. Reiffenstuel, for example, deals with the question pretty fully, and his views are quite representative. Briefly, he holds that this clause remedies the defect arising from subreption, but that it is no avail in the case of obreption, whether the false cause has been expressed in the petition or only in the rescript. So, too, he teaches

<sup>1</sup> 'Si motu proprio alicui aliquod beneficium obtinenti conferamus aliud de illo non habita mentione : non ob hoc gratiam hujusmodi, quae de nostra mera liberalitate processit, invalidam volumus reputari.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Si Romanus Pontifex de beneficio alicui motu proprio provideat, de beneficiis quae obtinet non habita mentione, provisionem seu gratiam hujusmodi fore validam declaramus, qualiacumque fuerint beneficia, dignitates, aut personatus cum cura vel sine cura, et in numero quocumque quae is habebat, cum sibi provisio facta fuit.'



that it does not remedy defects in the petitioner which incapacitate him from obtaining rescripts, nor does it operate to the prejudice of the acquired rights of third persons.<sup>1</sup>

This continued to be the discipline until the reformation of the Roman Curia by our late Holy Father Pope Pius X, in 1908. The *Normae Peculiares* for the Congregation of the Sacraments contain the following regulation :—

Dispensationes a minoribus impedimentis concedentur omnes *ex rationabilibus causis a S. Sede. Sede probatis*. Sic vero concessae perinde valebunt ac si *ex motu proprio et certa scientia* impertitae sint : ideoque nulli erunt impugnationi obnoxiae sive obreptionis vitio sive subreptionis.

From this disposition it is quite clear, of course, that dispensations from minor impediments were valid, notwithstanding any obreption or subreption which might have taken place in the petitions. But the further question arises as to whether it changed the discipline generally in regard to the force of the clause *Motu proprio* : it seems to presuppose that the effect of the clause in all circumstances is to counteract the defects arising not only from subreption but also from obreption. We do not think, however, that the presupposition was sufficient to change the general legislation on this matter : something more direct would be required to do so. Moreover, this was merely a particular regulation for the Congregation of the Sacraments regarding dispensations from minor impediments, and accordingly it would be unjustifiable to extend it beyond the scope clearly intended for it by the legislator.<sup>2</sup>

From what has been said, our correspondent can see that the Code and pre-Code discipline are practically in complete agreement. From Canons 45 and 1054 it is clear that a dispensation from minor matrimonial impediments is still valid, even though there has been obreption and subreption in the petition. Generally speaking, however, in accordance with Canons 45 and 46 the sole effect of the clause *Motu proprio* is to counteract the defect arising from subreption. The other causes which invalidate rescripts, such as obreption, incapacity in the petitioner, or opposition between the rescripts and the acquired rights of some third party between it and a local law or custom, still produce their effect notwithstanding the presence of this clause.

J. KINANE.

<sup>1</sup> *Jus. Can. Universum*, lib. i. Decret., tit. iii. n. 202 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ogetti, *De Curia Romana*, p. 73 : 'Circa quod nota, jus novissimum huic clausulae "ex motu proprio" aliquam majorem tribuere vim, quam ea fuerit, quae hucusque vigeat. Prius enim juxta Doctores haec clausula sanabat quidem vitium subreptionis . . . non autem obreptionis.'

## LITURGY

## THE MIDNIGHT MASS ON CHRISTMAS EVE, AND HOLY COMMUNION

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. Canon 821, § 2, states : ‘*In nocte Nativitatis Domini inchoari media nocte sola missa conventualis vel paroecialis*’; would you kindly say what is a ‘*missa paroecialis*’ in this case, and if one is at liberty to distribute Communion to the faithful on the occasion ? A doubt is raised about this because of the express mention of Holy Communion in the next section of the same canon.

II. (a) May this Mass be read or sung ; and (b) in defect of priests necessary for a Pontifical Mass in accordance with the Ceremonial may a Bishop sing this Mass with merely Deacon or Sub-deacon ?

III. May a priest say one midnight Mass in a parish church and two others, immediately afterwards, in a convent adjoining it ?

SUBSCRIBER.

I. The precise meaning of the words ‘*missa paroecialis*’ has been defined for us by the Congregation of Rites in reply to a query dated 28th November, 1884. The reply<sup>1</sup> is as follows : ‘*Parochialis Missa appellanda est quam Parochi diebus Festis etiam abrogatis tenentur applicare pro populo.*’ It is, therefore, synonymous with the ‘*missa pro populo*,’ i.e., the Mass which pastors of souls are bound to offer on Sundays and Holydays (even suppressed) for those under their charge. According to the canon cited by our correspondent, this Mass may begin at midnight on Christmas Eve in all churches, and the faithful who assist undoubtedly fulfil their obligation of hearing Mass on the Feast. As to whether the celebrant is at liberty to distribute Holy Communion at this Mass in the ordinary way there is some reason to doubt, and in the absence of an official ruling on the matter one cannot with confidence answer a definite ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ If the statement in Canon 821, § 2, cited by our correspondent, were the only factor in the case, we should have no hesitation in stating that Holy Communion might be distributed at this parochial Mass, as in any other ; but if we take into consideration previous legislation in regard to the midnight Mass and other canons of the Code itself, rather serious doubts arise as to the lawfulness of the practice. We have looked up several commentaries on the new Code dealing with this section and have sought information from recent editions of many works in Theology and Liturgy, but we cannot say that the result has been satisfactory. Some ignore the point at issue, others assert without giving any reason ; others hesitate to express an opinion. For example, Dr. Fortescue says : ‘People are allowed to receive Holy Communion at the midnight Mass, unless the Bishop, for some reason, forbids

<sup>1</sup> Decr. 3623.



this.<sup>1</sup> He cites as his authority for this statement the new Code, Can. 821, which, as we have seen, states nothing of the kind. Sabetti-Barrett is equally emphatic for the opposite contention. He says<sup>2</sup>: 'Imo putamus posse casus raros valde accidere in quibus liceret versus casum solis communionem distribuere. Prohibetur autem in Nocte Nativitatis Domini Fidelium communio, non vero in monasteriis etc.' And yet he seems hardly consistent, for in a comment on Can. 239, § 4<sup>o</sup>, granting the privilege to Cardinals 'celebrandi vel alii permittendi ut coram se celebret . . . tres Missas in Nocte Nativitatis Domini,' he writes<sup>3</sup>: 'Juxta hoc privilegium coram ipso liceret nocte Nativitatis tres Missas dicere, in quavis ecclesia apertis portis et communionem ministrare.' Ferreres, arguing from Can. 867, § 4, which says<sup>4</sup>: 'Sacra Communio iis tantum horis distribuatur quibus missae sacrificium offerri potest, nisi aliud rationabilis causa suadeat'—draws the conclusion<sup>5</sup>: 'Igitur licebit (*saltem probabiliter*) ministrare Eucharistiam in Missa Nativitatis Domini quae media nocte celebratur.' The reasons for the negative opinion would, we fancy, be twofold: (1) the privilege granted in Can. 821, § 2, of having a conventual or parochial midnight Mass is the lineal successor of the old privilege allowing a solemn or chanted midnight Mass in cathedrals or churches having choral service, and should, therefore, be regarded 'as subject to the same restrictions. In this Mass it was repeatedly stated by the Sacred Congregation' that it was unlawful to distribute Holy Communion<sup>6</sup>; (2) the fact that in Can. 821, § 3, it is expressly stated that at midnight Mass in Religious and Pious houses, etc., Communion may be administered to all who attend, emphasizes the continuance of the former restrictions in regard to the midnight Mass in churches. The reasons for the affirmative might be stated as follows: (a) The privilege of a parochial Mass, at which the people attend and for whom it is offered, should be interpreted as including that of administering Holy Communion, unless there is some valid reason to the contrary—'nisi aliud rationabilis causa suadeat.'<sup>6</sup> No such reason is stated in the Code and the reasons that might have availed in the case of the old privilege of solemn midnight Masses in churches with choral service are not apparent in this instance. (b) There is no mention of such a prohibition in Can. 867, which treats of the time and place wherein Communion may be administered, and 'ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.' (c) The express mention of the privilege in Can. 821, § 3, may be accounted for either on the ground that the general public are not, as a rule, at liberty to receive Communion in Religious houses, etc., or because this particular section of the canon is almost a *verbatim* reproduction of the decree of the Holy Office, 1st August, 1907, when, as the law then stood, it was necessary to have this innovation against established usages expressly

<sup>1</sup> Fortescue, *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite*, p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> *Compendium Theol. Moralis*, p. 617.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 663.

<sup>4</sup> *Compendium Theol. Moralis*, tom. ii. p. 225.

<sup>5</sup> Decr. 752, 781, 2267.

<sup>6</sup> Canon 867, § 4.

stated. Personally, we incline to the affirmative opinion, and should have no hesitation in acting on it.

II. (a) Yes; the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* on this point states<sup>1</sup>: 'Ex-tenditur enim juridica facultas ad Missam parochialem; non requiritur pro hujus celebratione cantus Matutini et lecta esse potest: Missa tamen conventualis e rubrica missalis regitur.'

(b) No; the following decree<sup>2</sup> of the Congregation of Rites is a complete answer to the query:—

Q. I. An Episcopus, quando alios ministros, quorum mentio fit in Caeremoniali Episcoporum, obtinere non valeat, Missam Pontificalem celebrare possit cum Diacono et Subdiacono? II. An Dominicis et aliis diebus festis, sacerdote absente qui hoc officio perfungitur, Missam ultimam cantatam in sua Cathedrali solus celebrari possit?

R. Ad I. et II. 'Negative.'

III. Yes, provided that the Mass in the church is a parochial Mass and that the convent in question has the faculty 'sanctissimam Eucharistiam habitualiter asservandi.' It is assumed, however, that these are the only midnight Masses said in this particular church and convent. Canon 821, § 3, states that in such a convent a priest may say 'tres rituales Missas vel, servatis servandis, unam tantum'; there would seem to be no reason why he could not say two, taking them in the order of the Missal.

#### REQUIEM MASS 'POST ACCEPTUM MORTIS NUNTIVM'—THE PRIVILEGED MASS OF THIRD AND SEVENTH DAYS 'POST OBITUM'

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. At page xii, No. 6°, of the *Ordo* the rule is given about High Mass or 'Missa cantata' *absente corpore*. It says that High Mass or sung Mass can be said '*pro prima tantum vice post obitum vel ejus acceptum a locis dissitis nuntium die quae prima accurrit, non impedita a festo duplici 1<sup>mae</sup> aut 2<sup>ndae</sup> classis vel a Dominica; vel Festo de praecepto (etiam abrogato).*' Supposing a person dies in the neighbouring parish and I hear about the death immediately, may I have a 'Missa cantata' on the following day in my parish, provided a feast of the above class does not occur? And could the same take place in each of the neighbouring parishes, and even in every parish of the diocese—granting that the deceased was a person of distinction who deserved well of the Church? Could, for instance, a 'Missa cantata' have been sung in each parish of the dioceses of Ireland—or even of the world—on the day following the receipt of the news of the death in London of the late Lord Mayor of Cork, if the day happened to be less than a double of the second class? I always thought that the rule had reference to the parish of origin or domicile of the recently departed. Has it a wider extension?

II. And in the case mentioned, was there any rubrical sanction for the arrangement of Requiem High Masses in Ireland on the Friday (duplex) and Saturday (vigilia) following the death?

PASTOR.

<sup>1</sup> August, 1920, p. 348.

<sup>2</sup> Decr. S.R.C. 3223.



I. The direction of the *Ordo* cited by our correspondent appeared before the publication of the new *Missale Defunctorum* and the subjoined decrees<sup>1</sup> of the Sacred Congregation were, at the time, the most recent legislation on the subject. The new rubrics have simplified matters, by putting this Mass ('*post acceptum mortis nuntium*') on an equality in respect of privilege with the Mass on the 3rd, 7th, 30th, and anniversary (strict) days. One rubric applies equally to all, which reads as follows (Tit. iii. 6°):—

In die autem III, VII, XXX et anniversaria ab obitu vel depositione Defunctorum, et prima die post acceptum mortis nuntium, in qualibet ecclesia permittitur unica Missa pro Defuncto, solemnibus vel etiam lecta, dummodo non occurrat Dominica, aut Festum de praecepto, licet suppressum, Commemoratio Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, Duplex I vel II classis, etiam translatum, aut aliqua ex Vigiliis, Feriis vel Octavis privilegiatis; quo in casu hujusmodi Missa in proximam diem pariter non impeditam anticipari, si anticipari valeat, aut transferri poterit, dummodo in cantu celebretur.

Now, apart from the extent of the privilege attaching to the celebration of this Mass, which is sufficiently clear in the rubric itself, there is a peculiarity in the wording of the rubric to which we should like to direct our correspondent's attention. He will observe (1) that there is no mention of the words '*a dissitis locis*,'—neither was there in the two latest decrees<sup>2</sup> on the subject (28th April, 1902, 31st March, 1909); and (2) that the Mass may be said 'in qualibet ecclesia.' Before the decree of December, 1891, the privilege of this Mass applied only to members of certain religious families: it was then extended not merely to Religious Orders, Congregations, Societies, and Religious Families, but also to particular persons, so that on the receipt of the notice of death '*a dissitis locis*' of any person, religious or secular, a solemn Mass could be chanted for the repose of his soul on days which would otherwise exclude a Requiem Mass. According to the new rubrics of the Missal the privileges attaching to the celebration of this Mass are the same as those of the 3rd, 7th, 30th and anniversary days, and as the words '*a dissitis locis*' are omitted, there is no limitation as to the number of Masses that may be said, provided always the rule is observed, i.e., '*unica Missa, sollemnis vel lecta, in qualibet ecclesia.*' The *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, as early as 1908 (p. 168), commenting on recent decrees on this subject, deduced a like inference: '*quia privilegium accipiendum est sicut sonat et ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus. Imo olim dicebatur: post acceptum in loco dissito nuntium, sed hodie et haec conditio sublata est.*'

II. In the rubric above cited it is clear that the privileged Mass '*post acceptum mortis nuntium*' should be said on the first available (*non impedita*) day after the receipt of the news, and as in this particular instance the news of the death must have reached every parish on

<sup>1</sup> Decr. S.R.C., 3755<sup>3</sup>, 4096<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Decr. 4096, 4235<sup>3</sup>.

Monday—or at latest on Tuesday<sup>1</sup>—we are driven to seek other reasons in justification of the Requiem Masses chanted on Friday and Saturday of the same week. Firstly with regard to Saturday, there were two reasons that manifestly justified the singing of the Requiem Mass: (1) it was one of the common Vigils and the new Rubrics (tit. iii. 9) permit even a '*Missa Quotidiana quae in cantu celebratur*' on these days, (2) or the privileged Mass of the 7th day *post obitum* might have been sung—anticipated in accordance with the rubric (tit. iii. 6), above cited, because Sunday, the actual 7th day, did not admit the exercise of the privilege.

Secondly as regards Friday, we are of opinion that the Masses were rubrically justifiable on the plea of privilege attaching to the 3rd day *post obitum*. The 3rd day may be counted either from the day of death or of burial,<sup>2</sup> and in the computation the actual day of death or burial may be either included or excluded.<sup>3</sup> In this instance, excluding Monday, the actual day of death, the privilege would ordinarily have availed for Thursday, but as this day was excluded by the occurrence of a double of 2nd class, the privilege was transferable to the next available day (Friday) not similarly impeded. Hence, though Friday was a Feast of double rite, we think Requiem Masses might have been sung for the intention specified, in conformity with the rubrics of the Missal.

#### IS A CONVENT ORATORY SEMI-PUBLIC? THE CHANTING OF THE 'PROPRIA' IN A SUNG MASS. PRAYERS AFTER MASS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly inform me, at your convenience, in the I. E. RECORD:—

I. Is a convent oratory 'semi-public'? It seems so from Canon 1188, yet some think otherwise.

II. May the Ordinary, without application to Rome, permit the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in a convent oratory?

III. May the celebrant of a '*Missa cantata*' chant the '*propria*' when there is no one else to do so? If he may not, is it permissible for a nun to chant the '*propria*'?

IV. May a parish priest order his curates to regularly recite the Divine Praises at the conclusion of Prayer to St. Michael after Mass? It is a parochial, not a general custom.

V. Are the Prayers after Mass ordered by the Pope forbidden at the end of a '*Missa cantata*,' or may they be said, though not of obligation, at the end of such a Mass?

CONCERNED.

I. It not only seems so, but manifestly is. If 'those who think otherwise' have still any doubt about it, we would refer them to the

<sup>1</sup> Tuesday and Wednesday in the general Irish *Ordo* were both available days for the Mass.

<sup>2</sup> Decr. 3753<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Van der Stappen, tom. ii. p. 342: '*Insuper quaeri potest an dies Obitus debeat ipse includi an excludi. Ad hoc respondere licet utrumque servari posse juxta Ecclesiarum consuetudinem.*'



following definition<sup>1</sup> of a semi-public oratory, given by Leo XIII in 1899:—

Oratoria semi-publica ea esse quae in loco quodammodo privato vel non absolute publico, auctoritate Ordinarii erecta sunt; commodo tamen non Fidelium omnium nec privatae tantum personae aut familiae, sed alicujus communitatis vel personarum coetus inserverint . . . Hujus generis oratoria sunt quae pertinent ad Seminaria et Collegia ecclesiastica; ad pia Instituta et Societates votorum simplicium, aliasque Communitates sub regula sive statutis saltem ab Ordinario approbatis; ad Domus spiritualibus exercitiis addictas,' etc.

II. Yes, as clearly stated in Canon 1265, § 2, of the new Code.

III. If there is nobody to chant the 'propria' the priest should say a Low Mass. There is no sanction, as far as we know, for the singing of the 'propria' by the celebrant of the Mass. In the absence of an organized choir a nun might chant the 'propria' for an occasion—'nunquam in Ecclesiis Monialium decantetur Epistola ab una ex ipsis'<sup>2</sup>—but we do not think the practice commendable from a liturgical point of view.

IV. The recitation of the Divine Praises after Mass or Benediction is not a general custom, but wherever it exists, with the consent of the Ordinary, it may be continued.<sup>3</sup> In each of the decrees sanctioning the use of such prayers the Holy See expresses the wish that there should be a uniformity of practice as far as possible, and we think the parish priest will be quite within his right in insisting on such uniformity, at least in the parochial church. As regards the obligation of the curate in the case, if such a regulation is made, consult Canon 476, § 7, of the Code.

V. In the original decree of Leo XIII (6th January, 1884) prescribing these prayers, and in all subsequent decrees confirming them, it is clearly stated that there is question only of Masses 'sine cantu,' so that we can deduce no sanction therefrom for their recitation after a 'Missa Cantata.' A decree,<sup>4</sup> however, dated 31st August, 1867, makes no distinction as to the quality of the Mass after which prayers may immediately follow, and if our correspondent is satisfied that the condition specified therein is fulfilled, viz., that they are said with the consent of the Ordinary, we see no reason why the answer to his query should not be in the affirmative: 'Q. An possint praecepti aut saltem permitti aliquae preces recitandae ad Altare post Missam, non depositis sacris vestibus?' R. 'Affirmative; dummodo preces dicantur assentiente Ordinario.'

M. EATON.

<sup>1</sup> Decr. 4007.

<sup>2</sup> Decr. 3350.

<sup>3</sup> S.R.C., 19th August, 1904; Decr. 31577.

<sup>4</sup> Decr. 31577.

# DOCUMENTS

## APOSTOLIC LETTER DECREERING A SOLEMN TRIDUUM AT THE LIBERIAN BASILICA, AND SIMILAR SUPPLICATIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD IN HONOUR OF ST. JEROME ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTENARY OF HIS DEATH

(September 15, 1920)

[In the Liberian Basilica the Solemn Triduum will take place on the 17th, 18th and 19th of December ; in other parts of the world the Triduum may be arranged at the discretion of each Bishop to take place at any time between September 30th and the end of the present year. Plenary and partial indulgences are granted to those taking part in the celebration.]

DECERNITUR DE TRIDUANIS SOLLEMNIBUS ET DE CAPPELLA PAPALI IN BASILICA LIBERIANA HABENDIS ET DE SIMILIBUS SUPPLICATIONIBUS IN UNIVERSO CATHOLICO ORBE PERAGENDIS IN HONOREM SANCTI HIERONYMI, ECCLESIAE DOCTORIS, DECIMO QUINTO SAECULO AB EIUS OBITU EXEUNTE, ET INDULGENTIAE PLENARIA ET PARTIALES CONCEDUNTUR.

### BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Universis Christifidelibus praesentes Litteras inspecturis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Cum in honorem sancti Hieronymi, Ecclesiae Doctoris, saeculo quintodecimo ab eius obitu exeunte, Pia Societas, ab eodem nuncupata, pro Evangeliiis vulgandis, sibi propositum habeat sollemnia celebrandi, Nos, in eminenti Sedis Apostolicae loco, disponente Domino, collocati, iniuncti Nobis officii munera cupientes salubriter exsequi, hoc laudabile Piae Societatis inceptum, quod ad excitandum provehendamque fidelium pietatem erga eundem Ecclesiae Doctorem erit summopere profuturum, amplissime probamus. Hieronymus enim, licet Stridone in Pannonia natus, in hac alma Urbe Nostra studiis litterarum sacrarumque disciplinarum vacavit, et postea diu sancti papae Damasi scribe atque a secretis perdiligens assiduusque fuit. Inter praestantissimos vero antiqui aevi christiani scriptores nemo forte reperiatur, qui acrius fidei morumque integritatem adversus haereticos et pravos christianos tuitus sit ; at omnium consensu habetur et colitur Doctor Maximus Sacris Scripturis explanandis atque interpretandis, et Vulgata, quam eius studiis et laboribus Ecclesia debet, non modo est, Concilii Tridentini decreto, authentica declarata et usu ecclesiastico recepta, sed etiam a doctis viris cotidie pluris aestimatur.



Quam ob rem Piae Societatis, quae patrocínio ac praesidio Magistri omnium latinorum Sacrae Scripturae interpretum utitur, visum est Nobis merito commendare propositum, quod supra memoravimus, saecularia sollemnia celebrandi in Patriarchali Basilica sanctae Mariae Maioris, vulgo 'Liberiana': in quam, ut e constanti hominum memoria testimoniisque fide dignis colligitur, temporibus expeditionibus Crucigerorum a sepulcro Bethlemitico translatum est corpus sancti Doctoris, ibique servatur et pie colitur. Ut igitur, in hisce saecularibus sollemnibus, Piae Societati a sancto Hieronymo, de Evangeliorum divulgatione tam praeclare merita, gratificemur, et simul sancti Doctoris cultum magis magisque apud Christifideles provehamus, statuimus peculiari voluntatis Nostrae significatione faustae commemorationis laetitiam ac sollemnitatem augere. Itaque decernimus in Liberiana Basilica, diebus decimo septimo, octavo et nono mensis decembris, hoc anno, triduanas haberi supplicationes, et, ad liturgiae splendorem amplificandum, postremo ex tribus die, id est decimo nono, Missam et alia divina officia in eodem templo in Pontificalibus celebranda, etsi Nobis absentibus, super altare maximum, Summis Pontificibus reservatum, peragi, adstantibus Emissis ac Reverendis S. R. E. Cardinalibus, nec non RR. DD. Praelatis, qui ius habent ad Cappellas Papales conveniendi, tamquam si coram Nobis Sacra, illa celebrarentur. Licentiam tamen huiusmodi, per has Apostolicas Litteras, uti mos est, pro hac vice tantum concedimus atque impertimur. Ut sollemnia autem, quae supra diximus, uberiore cum spirituali emolumento celebrentur, largimur ut omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus Christifidelibus, qui, vere poenitentibus et confessis ac sacra Communione refectis basilicam sanctae Mariae Maioris, ultimo sollemnium praedictorum die, devote visitaverint vel Sacris inibi, ob hanc causam peractis, interfuerint, ibique de more pro Christianorum principum concordia, haeresum exstirpatione, peccatorum conversione ac sanctae Matris Ecclesiae exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effuderint, plenariam, semel tantum, omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Itemque iisdem Christifidelibus, qui, duobus triduanae supplicationis praecedentibus diebus, praedictam basilicam devote visitaverint, ibique, corde saltem contriti, ut supra oraverint, septem annos et totidem quadragenas de iniunctis eis, seu alias quomodolibet debitis poenitentiis, in forma Ecclesiae consueta relaxamus. Quas omnes et singulas indulgentias, peccatorum remissiones ac poenitentiarum relaxationes etiam animabus Christifidelium in Purgatorio detentis per modum suffragii applicari posse indulgemus. Quo autem huius decimi-quinti saecularis anni commemoratio fructuosior ac sollemnior exsistat, optamus, ut intra annum a tricesimo die huius mensis septembris, in toto orbe catholico, quo et tempore et modo cuique Episcopo videbitur, sollemnis similis in honorem sancti Hieronymi, Ecclesiae Doctoris, triduanas supplicatio fiat: cui quotquot interfuerint, eis omnibus et singulis indulgentias, quas et uti supra memoravimus, usitatis condicionibus, lucrari licebit. Quam triduanam supplicationem in dioecesibus peragendam aliave sollemnia vehementer cupimus ut praecipue promoveant.

sodales Societatum a sancto Hieronymo, sicubi exsistant, Academiae theologiae et quotquot in Seminariis et in studiorum Universitatibus rei biblicae vacant, ut magnus iste Sanctus ipsis non solum caelestis solatii copiam, sed idonea quoque auxilia benigne a Deo imploret ad recte Sacram Scripturam interpretandam, ab adversariis tuendam fructuoseque meditandam. Non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus ac Litteris apostolicis in contrarium praemissorum quomodo libet concessis, ceterisque contrariis quibuslibet.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris, die xv mensis septembris, anno MCMXX, Pontificatus Nostri septimo.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

### THE TYPICAL EDITION OF THE NEW ROMAN MISSAL IS APPROVED

(July 25, 1920)

[An advertisement enclosed in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for October announces the publication of this edition on October 20th. Other and cheaper editions will, we expect, speedily follow.]

#### DE EDITIONE TYPICA MISSALIS ROMANI

Evulgata editione typica Breviarii Romani a fel. rec. Pio Papa X, per Decretum Sacrae Rituum Congregationis die 25 martii 1914 approbata, Commissio Pontificia ab eodem Pontifice die 2 iulii 1911 instituta, quae illam editionem, ad normam Bullae *Divino afflatu* et Motu Proprio *Abhinc duos annos* et subsequentium huius Sacrae Congregationis Decretorum, concinnandam curavit, easdem normas prae oculis habens, diligenti studio manus apposuit editioni Missalis Romani instaurandae. In qua editione, ex altera typica anni 1900 deprompta, illud tantum innovatum est, quod ex recentibus praescriptionibus liturgicis et ex additionibus et variationibus in Breviario typico inductis, consequeretur. Insuper praesenti editioni Missalis Romani adiectae sunt, ad modum Appendicis, Missae propriae pro aliquibus locis approbatae, quae in respectivis festis particularibus, vel in eorum solemnitatibus externis, ubi ex Indulto Sanctae Sedis concessum est, commode adhiberi poterunt. Itaque has mutationes ordinate dispositas, suis locis respective adiunctas et accurate revisas, prouti in hac editione prostant, Sacra Rituum Congregatio, de mandato Sanctissimi Domini nostri Benedicti Papae XV, probari posse censuit. Sanctitas porro Sua, referente infrascripto Cardinali eidem Sacrae Congregationi Praefecto, hanc ipsam editionem suprema Sua auctoritate probavit, eamque uti Typicam habendam esse, cui omnes editiones in posterum conformandae erunt, declaravit atque decrevit.

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque etiam speciali mentione dignis.

Die 25 iulii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,  
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius*.



APPROVAL OF A NEW TYPICAL EDITION OF THE  
'MEMORIALE RITUUM'

(January 14, 1920)

[The Decree was published in October, 1920.]

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

DE EDITIONE TYPICA MEMORIALIS RITUUM

Memoriale Rituum, quod pro aliquibus praestantioribus sacris functionibus in Ecclesiis minoribus a Summo Pontifice Benedictio XIII probatum eiusque iussu editum fuit ac pluries reproductum, nunc iuxta leges liturgicas etiam recentiores diligenti studio revisum atque opportune reformatum, Sanctissimus Dominus noster Benedictus Papa XV, ex Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis consulto, suprema Sua auctoritate recognovit, atque hanc Memorialis Rituum editionem tamquam typicam habendam esse sancivit: simulque statuit ac declaravit, ut eidem editioni omnes ceterae in posterum conformari atque authentico testimonio comprobari debeant; servatis normis, quae pro editione librorum liturgicorum traditae sunt typographis per decretum eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis n. 4266, die 17 maii anno 1911. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 14 ianuarii 1920.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,  
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. ✠ S.

ALEXANDER VERDE, *Secretarius*.

# REVIEWS AND NOTES

A HISTORY OF THE DIOCESE OF RAPHOE. By the Very Rev. E. Canon Maguire, D.D. Vols. I. and II. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd.

THESE two volumes constitute the first part of this important addition to the histories of our Irish dioceses. They deal with ecclesiastical matters. Part II., which is to follow, will treat of the various dynasties, wars, families, raths, etc. The plan adopted in the work is analytic. It takes each parish separately, gives its history down through the centuries, as well as a list, as far as can be ascertained, of the priests who served in each parish severally. We notice that this plan has been followed in other cases of diocesan histories. We must candidly confess that we do not look with favour on such a method of treatment. We prefer the synthetic method. It is easier to write history according to the analytic method, and it may suit better people who take an interest in the history of a particular parish and who wish to get it all in one chapter. But, we think that the writing of history should deal rather with movements, important events, etc., into which the history of a locality should enter in due course. Lists of priests and dates are all very well, but they are only secondary. The main theme is the general historical movement. No doubt, Dr. Maguire may have had good reason for adopting the present plan.

As regards the book itself, we cannot praise too highly the labours of the author. As he tells us in his Preface, he 'has made a strenuous attempt to rifle public libraries and private collections of books and manuscripts.' His modesty concerning his efforts is, no doubt, admirable, but his success may lawfully beget a pardonable pride. We admire his courageous spirit in attempting such a huge task. Some one should undertake such works, and there are plenty of priests who can. No one is bound to do so, but the man that comes forward, feeling a call to write, deserves every encouragement and praise, no matter how inadequately he may have accomplished his task. In this case *inadequately* does not apply. We should rather apply the word *magnificently*.

The first volume, besides accounts of a few parishes, gives a concise general history of the diocese of Raphoe, and deals with the Primate's Rights in Raphoe, the Cross of Raphoe Cathedral, Temporalities,



the Bishop's Revenues, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons and Chapter of Raphoe. The second volume deals with the remaining parishes of the diocese, and contains a very useful index. The volumes, of convenient size, are neatly brought out and profusely illustrated. We heartily congratulate the author on his learned and well-documented history, and sincerely hope that it may meet with the practical approbation it deserves, which may be a stimulus to him to proceed with the very important second part.

M. R.

THE DIVINE OFFICE. A Study of the Roman Breviary. By Rev. E. J. Quigley. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

SINCE the publication of the revised Breviary of Pius X many books have appeared from Continental liturgical writers in explanation of the several changes introduced, and the occasion has been availed of by some to place those changes in their historical setting as the latest stages in a development which reaches back to the very beginnings of Christianity. For example, the new edition of Mgr. Battifol's *History of the Breviary* is a master-piece of historical research. And it is interesting, too, for after the Bible and the Missal there is no more wonderful book in the world than the Breviary—none more excellent in the nature of its contents, none more worthy of study and examination. Its history is an epitome of the history and development of the Church; it contains the Church's official prayer, fashioned and embellished in the course of ages, ever changing, yet ever fundamentally remaining the same. For priests, especially, the mouthpieces of the Church in her public prayer, it is a hallowed and a treasured book. It has for them the character of life-long companionship, severable only in death, always loved and esteemed in proportion to their zeal and love for their sacred calling. The devout recitation of the Divine Office is a solemn duty imposed by the Church on her priests, and any work purporting to help them towards a due and efficient discharge of that obligation has therein the hall-mark of importance, sufficient to stimulate their interest and invite their attention. That such is the purport of this excellent hand-book by Father Quigley is clearly indicated by himself. 'It may be useful,' he says, 'to junior students in Colleges, in giving them some knowledge of the Church's Hours, which they assist at in their College Choirs. It may assist them to know and love the official prayers of the Church, and may help to form devout habits of recitation, so that when the obligation of the daily Office is imposed on them, they may recite it *digne, attente et devote*. . . . Perhaps it may be a help to priests. It is an attempt to bring into one handy volume many matters found in several volumes of history, liturgy, theology, and ascetic literature. Some of the pages may be to them instructive, and may give them new ideas on such points as the structure

of the Hours, the Collects, the *Te Deum*, the Anthems of the Blessed Virgin,' etc. We have read Father Quigley's book with a good deal of interest, and we can confidently tell him to be of good heart—there is not a shadow of doubt as to the utility of his work. He has given us a book which will be a decided help to students in our Colleges and to priests, young and old, a book that leaves us all his debtors, and will, no doubt, receive a generous welcome and appreciation. It was no small undertaking to compress within less than three hundred pages 'matters found in several volumes of history, liturgy, theology, and ascetic literature,' yet this is what Father Quigley has done, and done so admirably that one is at a loss which to appraise the more—the varied character and extent of the author's information, or the graceful and pleasing style in which it is conveyed. A resumé of the table of Contents will give an idea of the scope and character of the work. Part I.—Sketch of the history of the Breviary—the several parts of the Breviary—the general Rubrics. Part II.—The rules from moral and ascetical theology for the due recitation of the Office. Part III.—The origin and structure of each of the Canonical Hours in detail. Part IV.—A useful and interesting chapter on Hortology. Then there are two appropriate Appendices: I. A brief and well-informed discussion on the Hymns of the Divine Office; II. A useful Bibliography relative to the several aspects of the Breviary.

The chapter which pleased us best, and which we think will be regarded as the most valuable asset of the book, is the author's treatment of the rules—from theology, ascetical and moral—for the devout recitation of the Office. It is full of interest, thorough, practical, instructive and devotional.

When the author comes to write of the rubrics of the Breviary we do not, somehow, find him so much at his ease. He is slightly too apologetic and confessedly afraid of pit-falls. The decisions of the Congregation of Rites come with such unexpected frequency that an author can rarely feel sure that his work is absolutely up to date—that his accuracy is unimpeachable in every detail. Readers must make allowance for this, and they must not expect that by mastering the chapter on rubrics in this or any other single manual of the kind they can thereupon proceed with confidence to the compilation of an *Ordo*. We have carefully examined this section of the work and have detected very few slips, and none of so serious a nature as to mar the all-round accuracy of the book. Before, however, the book receives a second impression, we might note the following points for the author's attention:—(1) Page 44—paragraphs 2 and 3 go more appropriately with preceding Tit. II. p. 43; (2) page 49—the paragraph beginning, 'If there be twenty Sundays,' etc., needs correction; (3) page 50—the last paragraph needs altering. There is no mention of the ordinary or 'minor Ferie'; (4) pages 188, 189—there is confusion between the *Preces Dominicales* and



the *Preces Ferales*; (5) page 167—the *Te Deum* is said on Feast of Holy innocents if it falls on a Sunday.

We have no hesitation in recommending Father Quigley's book to students and priests as an able and useful contribution to the study of the Roman Breviary, and we shall not be surprised to hear that a second and further editions of the work are speedily called for. The present edition appears with the Irish trade mark, printed and bound in Ireland, and reflects credit on the Dublin firm responsible for its production.

M. E.

PREVIS COLLECTIO EXCERPTA E 'RITUALI PARVO' IN USUM CLERI EXTRA  
LOCA SACRA MINISTRANTIS. Cura Rev. J. B. O'Connell. Dublin :  
James Duffy & Co., Ltd.

As the title indicates, this is an excerpt from the edition of the Ritual (*Rituale Parvum*) published last year by Messrs. Duffy & Co., and purports to meet the convenience of priests in their ritual ministrations 'extra loca sacra.' So far as it goes the work is accurately and ably done, and we have no doubt that many priests who have already procured the larger Ritual for their churches will welcome this convenient little excerpt by Father O'Connell. It would seem to be an ideal little book for Sick Calls, Funerals, and the usual Blessings that a priest is called upon to perform in the exercise of his mission. At the same time we think it regrettable that the compiler thus limited the scope of the work to the exclusion of the ordinary everyday ceremonies of Baptism (solemn), Matrimony, and Churching. The missionary priest, who has to travel to outlying churches on a Sunday, finds it inconvenient to carry about with him a Ritual as large as a Breviary (i.e., the *Rituale Parvum*), and where is the all-round utility of a pocket-edition, such as this, in which the usual Sunday ceremonies of Baptism and Churching do not appear? Either he must still continue to carry about the large Ritual or procure a copy of it for each of the churches. Neither of these alternatives may be convenient, and in a matter of this kind the convenience of the missionary priest is of the first importance. Moreover, the insertion of the ceremonies mentioned need not have entailed the enlargement of the book to any appreciable extent if a smaller type were used—as it stands, the type is unduly large, more especially in the heads of chapters; and the addition would, we think, not merely have enhanced its utility but made it much more acceptable at the price.

In an Appendix the compiler gives us the ceremony of 'Consecration of the Family to the Sacred Heart,' or, as it is more usually styled, the Enthronement of the Sacred Heart.' It is in strict accordance with the latest decrees on the subject, and priests who are called upon to perform the ceremony will be glad to have it thus conveniently to hand.

M. E.

LE CHRIST, VIE DE L'ÂME. Conférences Spirituelles par D. Columba Marmion. Abbaye de Maredsous (Belgique).

THIS book has reached its seventh edition. That alone is a clear index of its worth. As Cardinal Mercier says in his Preface to it : ' Les pages sont bienfaisantes. Elles reposent l'âme. Elles simplifient la vie chrétienne.' The Conferences are the fruit of several years of reflection and prayer. They were given to audiences of various kinds. The author, having had no idea of publishing them, had not committed them to writing. But some of his audience, believing them to be of permanent benefit, took abundant notes and begged the author to publish them. Father Marmion, realizing their imperfections, as they were delivered in a language other than his mother-tongue, did not see his way to publish them as they were. A devoted friend set himself the delicate and difficult task of gathering together the numerous notes and of co-ordinating them with a definite plan. The simple style of the author is preserved throughout, so also is the characteristic method of the author faithfully preserved. The Conferences are mainly a commentary on the words of Christ : ' Come to Me ; I am the Life of your souls ; you will find this Life only in Me, but you will find it in abundance '—*Veni ut vitam habeant et abundantius habeant*.

There are nineteen Conferences in all, covering about 580 pages. The author shows Divine Providence embracing in the same plan of pre-destination Christ, the Word made Man, and ourselves. Then, following the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas on the meditation of Christ, the Sanctifier of souls, he shows in Him, true God and true Man, the unique and universal exemplar of all holiness, the meritorious and satisfactory cause that has paid to divine justice the price of our salvation, according to the words of St. Paul : ' And being consummated, He became, to all that obey Him, the cause of eternal salvation, called by God a high-priest according to the order of Melchisedech ' (Heb. v. 9). Finally, Christ is the efficient cause of our holiness, for, always following the doctrine of the Apostle St. Paul, whom our author never wearies of quoting, ' of Him are you in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption ' (1 Cor. i. 30).

Having shown the office of Christ under its different aspects, Father Marmion considers the realization of the divine plan in souls. Christ forms His mystical body, the Church, visible and invisible. But the Holy Spirit has formed Christ—at least it is thus that theology expresses itself in the word ' appropriation,' and the ' Spirit of Jesus ' completes the work of our sanctification. Thus is portrayed the picture of the work of Christ, eternally conceived in the plan of the Heavenly Father and realized by Christ the Mediator, and by His Sanctifying Spirit. Christ is in the centre of the plan and of the work of God. In His theandric Person He includes all : *Tu solus sanctus, Tu solus Dominus, Jesu Christe*. The whole substance of evangelical spirituality is in this formula, as Father Marmion wisely says : ' For certain souls the life of Christ Jesus is a subject of meditation among many others. That is



not enough. Christ is not one of the means of the spiritual life ; He is our *whole* spiritual life.' The second portion of the work is devoted to showing the work of the soul that wishes to receive abundantly the divine life of which Christ is the source.

These Conferences bring out in bold, living relief the mystery of Jesus. All is led back to Christ, the source of all grace, of all life, of all sanctity. This fertile thought that affects the unity of the work brings out also its force.

A mere dry analysis deprives the book of its devotional flavour. It must be read and meditated on with the heart as well as with the head, as it is with all his soul of an apostle that the author throws himself into the Conferences. The Scriptural perfume that one breathes in every page of the book shows that the work has been prepared in prayer. Souls desirous of the interior life will welcome this work with gratitude. Religious communities, especially, to which these Conferences were given, will gather many flowers and fruits from them. It is a beautiful work, indeed, well planned and well edited. The matter of the Conferences is summarized in a very readable synopsis, and an exhaustive index adds considerably to its utility. The author throughout his Conferences relies on St. Thomas Aquinas as his sure and beloved guide. All his friends, and all former students of Clonliffe College, will gladly welcome this learned and devout work of the gifted Abbot of Maredsous, who received his early training in the Dublin Diocesan College.

M. R.

LE CHRIST DANS SES MYSTÈRES. Conférences Spirituelles par D. Columba Marmion, Abbé de Maredsous.

IN the previous work, *Christ the Life of the Soul*, the author's idea was to point out the fundamental characteristics of the Christian life according to the Gospel, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the conclusions of theology. The present Conferences are a logical sequence of the preceding. The life of Christ, the divine and always accessible exemplar of the Christian life, is portrayed for us in the mysteries, the virtues, and the acts of His Sacred Humanity. Thus, the mysteries of the Man-God are not only the models that we must consider, but they also contain the treasure of merit and of grace. The mysteries of Christ are ours also, but our knowledge of them is essential so that they may be fruitful to our souls. St. Paul is the great apostle of the mysteries of Christ, and his solicitude in regard to them is ever on his lips in his advice to the Churches : ' For I would have you know,' he says to the Colossians, ' what manner of care I have for you and for them that are at Laodicea, and whosoever have not seen my face in the flesh ; that their hearts may be comforted, being instructed in charity, and unto all riches of fulness of understanding, unto the knowledge of the mystery of God the Father and of Christ Jesus ; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.' And so St. Paul attributes the complete formation of the interior man to the practical knowledge of the mystery of Jesus. This knowledge

is the foundation of our holiness; it solidifies our spiritual life, and is the cause of our joy. In these mysteries Christ has lived for us, shown Himself our exemplar, and has united Himself to us who are the members of His mystical body. We assimilate the fruit of these mysteries by meditation on the Gospel, but especially by uniting ourselves with the Liturgy of the Church; 'ut dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus, *per hunc* in invisibilium amorem rapiamur,' and 'ut mysteria quae solemniter celebramus, officio, purificatae mentis intelligentia consequamur.' That is the knowledge that St. Paul wishes us to have, 'in omni sapientia et intellectu spiritali.' Hence the necessity for the faithful to have a clear understanding of the meaning and the importance of these Mysteries, and to participate in them, for they are all sources of special grace.

The author, then, sketches for us in ardent, living pictures the essential characteristics of the personality of Jesus and the Mysteries of the Man-God. From the Incarnation, through the Holy Childhood and hidden life of the Saviour, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Coming of the Holy Ghost, the Memorial of Christ in Sacrifice and Sacrament, to the crown of Christ's work in All Saints, the author leads us on with beautiful, soul-stirring reflections, full of unction, and of scriptural lore. He lives, and moves, and has his being in the Scriptures. Every line bears the inspiration of the Sacred Writings. His work is a beautiful tissue of that inspired splendour. We can well re-echo the words of our Holy Father Benedict XV, in a letter that he wrote to the author, 'With our thanks we unite our congratulations. . . . The publication of these volumes has indeed been a very happy inspiration.'

M. R.

### BOOKS, ETC., RECEIVED.

- America*: A Catholic Review (November).  
*The Ecclesiastical Review* (November). U.S.A.  
*The Rosary Magazine* (November). Somerset, Ohio.  
*The Catholic World* (November). New York.  
*The Austral Light* (October). Melbourne.  
*The Ave Maria* (November). Notre Dame, Indiana.  
*The Catholic Bulletin* (November). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Irish Monthly* (November). Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.  
*The Month* (November). London: Longmans.  
*Etudes* (November). Paris: 12 Rue Oudinot (VII<sup>e</sup>).  
*Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* (November). Paris: Beauchesne.  
*Revue du Clergé Français* (November). Paris: Letouzey et Ané.  
*The Fortnightly Review* (November). St. Louis, Mo.  
*The Lamp* (November). Garrison, N.Y.  
*Revue des Jeunes* (November). Paris: 3 Rue de Luynes.  
*Catechism Notes* (3rd Edition). Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Ltd.  
*Simple Instructions on the Short Catechism*. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Ltd.  
*In Mallow*. By Mrs. Wm. O'Brien. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.  
*Scripture Examples*. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.  
*The Message of Francis Thompson*. By a Sister of Notre Dame, London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.  
*Life of St. Leonard of Port-Maurice*. By Fr. Dominic Devas, O.F.M. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne.  
*Tractatus de Virtute Religionis*. Auctore O. E. Dignant (3rd Edition). Brugis: Car. Beyaert.









Does Not Circulate

IRISH Ecclesiastical Record.  
July-Dec.1 920.

BX 801 .I68 1920 Pt.2 SMC  
The Irish ecclesiastical  
record 47085658

v.16'

